

First Published in 1921

PREFACE

THE aim of this little book is to express in the light of our recent thought and experience the only thinkable and permanent relation between Man and Man, and so between the Man and the State, and to do so with special reference to the present burning question of the private ownership of wealth

The effort has been to present the matter in the briefest and most concise manner, and also in a popular form, *i.e.* in a form which will be acceptable to those who make no claim to be students in any special sense.

The learned may consider that much of what is here said regarding the private ownership of wealth is too obvious to need stating. I can only reply that this book is not specially written for students, and secondly, that my actual experience in talking with people and in attending meetings, shows me that there is nothing which I have said under that head, or indeed in any other part of the book, which does not urgently need saying,—and saying, not only in massive academical works of which we have plenty, but in brief and simple forms.

My ambition has been throughout this argument to emphasize, as simply and tersely as possible, what there is of rightness, *naturalness* and usefulness in our inherited religious, social and economic ideas. It is increasingly evident that if anyone would be of real help in our per-

turbed, distracted world, he must follow the example of Nature, and use, modify, fortify and build upon what already exists—that is, he must *conserve* and *use* what the natural evolution of civilized Man in general, and of our Nation in particular, has given us. In other words, reason and recent experience teach that, if we would progress, we must do so by the difficult process of conserving rather than by the easy one of destroying. This is the true and the only true “Conservatism.” If in view of past party politics a new term is desired, we might call this the New Conservatism. “New Conservatism” would have reference, not to any actual or possible political party, but to a substantive inspiration or ideal, an ideal which might be held by (and might so far unite) persons of very diverse political views.

Merely to destroy our social inheritance, fruit as that is of the prayers and tears, of the labour and of the lives laid down of so many generations, in the vague hope that afterwards we shall be able, all in a moment, to rig up some artificial system or another which shall prove workable, is to launch out, as it were, into an uncharted sea of speculation and empiricism, where general agreement would be impossible, and where there would be no basal moral principles to appeal to and to unite us. From such a state of things we could only expect as our reward, fruitless change, perpetual revolution and ultimate anarchy.

The reader will observe that a great distinction is made in this book between those who call themselves Socialists. In England many so call themselves in no specific or exclusive sense at all. Socialists, they presume, desire the welfare of mankind: they themselves also do that: therefore they also are Socialists. That is their argument.

PREFACE

vii

The word Socialist is in this book only used as defined in Part I. ; and a person is regarded as a Socialist so far, and only so far, as he holds the views of Socialists as those are here set forth in their essence.

Merely to desire that private ownership, private enterprise, competition and Freedom in general should not be lawless,—though that is certainly social,—is not specifically socialistic.

CONTENTS

PART I

	PAGE
THE PERSON, THE STATE AND RIGHTS . . .	I

PART II

WEALTH	65
------------------	----



APPENDICES	145
----------------------	-----

WEALTH AND YOU AND I

PART I

THE moral Right of the Individual to Wealth, not only to the possession of this or that amount or kind of wealth, but the Right to possess wealth at all, is to-day, as we know, a matter of heart-searching and of bitter, if not fierce controversy

This particular Right just now acquires a disproportionate importance, because the much vaster question of Right in general is at present mainly focused on that one right, so that our decision regarding the particular Right to possess will affect our view of Right in the abstract.

The problem would be much simplified and be much advanced on the road to solution if before discussing the right to possess we made up our minds on this subject of Right in general—whether in the first place there is such a thing. Agam, if we decide that Right exists we must make up our minds as to what is its moral and rational basis, what obligations it involves, and what claims it entitles us to make, and what claims it absolutely prohibits us from making.

There is in our midst an increasing number of people who say that there is no Right—and therefore no Wrong ; that there is only the Will of the State. Their cry is, "We have no king but Cæsar," which means that they recognize no authority but the State. All Absolutists and tyrannical people (Militarists, Communists, Despotists,—

whoever they may be) are fond of deifying the State, and of attributing to it an *absolute* character, to the utter destruction of the claims of Individuals. They do not, however, succeed in persuading others of this philosophy until religion and God (or, as in ancient times, the gods) have been largely removed from the thoughts and affairs of men. It was under such conditions that the Roman Emperor Domitian, in himself personifying the State, claimed (as the inevitable culmination of a gradual development) to be called "Our Lord and God"

It was these absolutistic claims on the part of the Roman State which caused the collision between the Christians and the Roman Authorities. The Christian Faith, though in this regard it is not always perfectly interpreted by its adherents, is of logical necessity on the side of Liberty, and the Christians perceived that the belief in God (as He is revealed in the Christian Faith) as the Absolute Being and only Absolute Imponent of Duty and Source of Right, was the one defence of mankind against Political Absolutism with its tyranny and its slavery.

We shall not go far in our examination of Right before we find that it is intimately bound up with another question, namely, what is Man? is he a spiritual Being or Person related to the Absolute and Infinite Being and therefore, while a part of the State, at the same time transcending the State, or is he, on the contrary, purely material, an automaton, a mere congeries of atoms? If he is the former he has a reference beyond the State, and the State is therefore not absolute, but itself rests upon the Absolute for its guidance and moral authority. If, on the other hand, he is merely material, there can be neither absolute moral Right nor Wrong, because for him there is no Absolute, no morals and no free will. In his view praise and blame are meaningless, because for him every effort, every truth, affection, emotion or ideal is ultimately a mere matter of the aimless unintelligent movement of atoms,

and atoms cannot be imponents of Duty nor the source of moral Right and Wrong Everything, including even Beauty, is to such a one merely relative to his likes and dislikes, with no absolute reference or basis whatever.¹ Even his fellow-man can have no absolute moral value, and must as far as possible be subordinated to his pleasure

Materialists are usually illogical enough covertly to presuppose Free Will, enough Free Will that is to enable them to make laws and to demand and expect obedience to them. In this case they will when possible capture and utilize the State in order to make laws after a tyrannical and absolutist manner German Militarists and Russian Bolshevists are among the very numerous instances of this

The objector may urge at this point that while we cannot extract from Matter the ideas of Right and Wrong as motives and guides of our action, yet there remains "Utility," and the best men will seek and pursue what is "useful" for their fellow-men

But apart from an absolute Right, there could be no "best" men in any moral sense; and again, apart from

¹ Even the pursuit of Physical Science would be shorn of its rational foundation We admire scientists because, like all sincere thinkers, they pursue Truth But if the world has no Intelligence behind it (an Intelligence not *less* than Personal) they are not doing anything grand and noble at all, but are demeaning their minds to the registering of mere meaningless sequences and intellectually baseless classifications If the Universe is not a revelation of Mind, it is unworthy of the reverence and study of the human mind Moreover, in the absence of moral Right and absolute Good, the moral aspect of Truth disappears, and there is no obligation to study it, nor anything good or beautiful in doing so Science might indeed be pursued in the form of Applied Science for the material advantage of Mankind, but apart from the idea of Right, there would be no reason why it should be so pursued, nor could those who pursue it be esteemed When we have emptied Truth of both its intellectual and moral content, it is evident to all minds that there is not much left, and to many minds it is evident that there is in reality nothing left

such absolute Right it is impossible that there should be an absolutely "useful " We should in that regard, as in all others, have nothing to rely on either as motive or as guide, but our merest likes and dislikes , and upon such matters no two people are agreed

Leaving on one side the great metaphysical difficulties of materialism, and also the difficulty of imagining an Individual with no Free Will, deliberately and as a matter of choice, electing to seek after public " Utility " (or in that manner seeking after anything), we have to face the fact that in the absence of absolute moral Right, it would not be " right " to seek the good of one's fellow-men, whether on utilitarian lines or any other. This does not mean that it would be "wrong " to do so , it means that the pursuit of the general good, and any self-sacrifice in that interest, would be merely a question of individual fancy, of likes and dislikes, to which neither praise nor blame could rationally be attached

" Utility," if it is to be a rational object of endeavour, and if it is to be pursued consistently, both when it pleases us and when it does not, must be pursued as a Duty, and both the " Utility " itself and the methods we employ must be determined by Right

The idea of Right does not involve that we can say of each and every action that it is in itself and *a priori* good or bad , though it is true that there are some actions which are and must always be bad But these apart, the goodness or the badness of an action will depend upon how the action was conditioned by motive and other circumstances Thus it is not necessarily wrong even to kill people : soldiers, judges, executioners do this and are praised by good citizens But murder is wrong, because that means killing people with a bad motive, or in defiance of Law The mere act, however, in the two cases is the same " Right " or " Wrong " cannot in general be predicated of any specific action viewed merely as action

When we inquire into Human Personality, we find each one of us that we are asking, "What am I, and what are You? What is our true relation, and upon what is it based; and what obligations does it involve?"

Leaving the Christian Religion on one side, there are two ways of satisfying ourselves regarding the existence and nature of Personality. One is to demonstrate it by reasoning or philosophy, the other is to examine and rely upon our actual experience and knowledge of ourselves.

It is beyond the scope of this book to treat of the philosophy or metaphysics of Human Personality, but nevertheless we may glance in passing at some of the things that philosophy tells us.

Modern philosophy, from Kant onwards, has brought immense intellectual support and corroboration to the intuitive knowledge which we all possess, that we are spirits, individually related to the Infinite and Absolute, gifted with Free Will and therefore with moral responsibility,—responsibility each one for his own relation to the Absolute Person, and each one for his own relation with his fellow-men (equal sharers with himself in the Divine or Absolute Nature), and for the maintenance of *their* individual dignity and divinity equally with his own.

Now each one of us knows that behind all his sensations and emotions there is an "ego" or "I"; in other words, all plain people know that they are Persons. The first characteristic of this "I" is that it is conscious of *itself*. It does not merely have sensations, but it is able to reflect upon its sensations and analyse them and piece them together, making out of them objects which it can deliberately classify and correlate together in a rational and intelligent manner as parts of a World which it *knows a priori* to be rational and intelligible and the creation of the Divine Wisdom. The objects thus acquire *specific* meanings, and the World in its turn is still further revealed

section of the people) would be so excessively degrading and unpleasant, but because it emanates from or is an expression of Personality, *i e* of the transcendental spiritual nature of Man

The necessity of reasoning in defence of Personality and Right, and of demonstrating their nature and foundation, and the necessity also of showing in what consists the moral character of Law, and our obligation to obey it, is rendered almost terribly evident by the recent utterances and superficial arguments of people of all classes, interests and political opinions. These persons show an almost complete ignorance of, or indifference or hostility to, the most obvious principles underlying our lives as Human Beings and as Citizens, and underlying the whole fabric of our State and of our Law. "I fancy this, I fancy that"; "I want this; I want that," seem now to be regarded as sufficient justification for action of any kind, and a proper and firm basis even for legislation. A time comes naturally when the various fanciers have to decide whose fancy is to prevail, and in proportion as the transcendental ideal of Right recedes from view, the matter at issue tends to become a question of mere Force.

This preliminary discussion of the whole subject of Personality and Right, while it will show upon what moral grounds we base our right to make, to keep and to inherit Wealth, will also, so it is hoped, demonstrate what are the moral grounds upon which we claim any Right at all, *eg* the right to Freedom of speech, the right to religious Freedom, or the right to our ownership of our bodies. Further, seeing that Law, if it is moral, must exist primarily for the purpose of enforcing Right and restraining those who trespass against it, this inquiry will help us to realize that Law has a moral foundation, to perceive in what that foundation consists, and what is our obligation to obey the Law.

* * * * *

should think that these things *were* ourselves, but merely that we should not be able to *think about* or reason upon our impressions at all. We should have impressions, as might a sentient looking-glass, but apart from an Ego or "I" standing outside the impressions and itself other than them, the "I" or Person could not know he had impressions, and so reflect and reason upon them, as in this case there would be no "I" to stand outside and be aware of impressions, and again no "I" to reason upon them.

Without we could stand outside our impressions and contemplate them and reflect upon them we could not use Reason, and without Reason or Understanding we could not reflect upon ourselves and our impressions.

Here is another capacity of Personality as such. We are all born with the latent idea of natural Law, which idea becomes realized, active and positive as soon as contact with phenomena provides the materials for its realization. We are not born with any notion of this or that particular Law (for these Laws, as far as the necessities of thought are concerned, might all have been otherwise), but we are compelled as soon as we think at all to assert, consciously or unconsciously, that whatever particular Laws do as a matter of fact exist, they must conform to the principle of Uniformity and Universality, *i.e.* the abstract idea of Law. Unless Personality was gifted with this Law idea, we should have no notion of Laws,¹ and Science could not even begin. It must always be remembered that mere impressions or sensations *convey no knowledge*, it is our interpretation of these things according to the innate principles of our Personality which constitutes conscious experience, *i.e.* that experience which alone is of use to Thought.

¹ If the Law idea did not exist, we might by frequent repetition of certain events associate the particular events together in the way of mere unintelligible sequence, but with no reference to an all-embracing ordered system

as justifying the assumption made by the Person regarding its rationality and intelligibility.

The human relation with the World is not one of mere blind association, it is one of deliberate thought. Placing itself outside its sensations and thoughts, the "I" can rationally contemplate these things, and itself in relation to them, and to the Source of all being. The "I" comes into the World equipped and prepared to do this. It does not come into the World "in utter nakedness," but it comes in endowed in various ways.

Thus, for instance, it comes in gifted with Self-consciousness and Free Will. Without these related things there could, of course, be no moral responsibility; for if we had no Free Will (or Volition, as it is called), and if we were, as probably animals are,¹ incapable of looking back upon, and estimating or judging ourselves, none of our actions would or could be "deliberate," and we should be creatures of mere impulse, *i.e.* mere sentient automata.

But the "I" or Person comes into the World also with a certain latent or potential Understanding or Reason. Thus we are not only in actual fact in apposition to, or outside of and other than the things we perceive, but we have also the ability of being *conscious* of this fact, *conscious* that the things we perceive are not ourselves. This does not mean that apart from self-consciousness we

¹ We know little of the mental processes of animals. We know that they are sentient in regard of objects, but they are presumably not *self-conscious*, and so while having sensations they cannot be conscious of them and reflect upon them and tell themselves what they mean. If animals have no Personality, and are therefore not self-conscious,—conscious, that is, of themselves and their impressions,—they would not be able to reflect upon and analyse their impressions, and find in them the rational principles of Law and of Cause and Effect, and so for them objects would not be related in a reasoning manner as parts of an intelligible Whole, but would be connected by mere blind association, or by unreasoning "instinct." The Personal nature of Man is not, however, affected by any theory regarding animals.

base. So inferior is some Social Heredity that in certain would-be good ideas and actions of certain well-meaning men the only good thing about the thought or action lies in the good motive of the Individual, *i. e.* in his desire to do Right. Even in this case we see that the abstract idea of Right and Wrong remains; and all men will praise or blame each other according as they suppose their motive was Right or Wrong.

Suppose now a Person born without the latent or potential moral idea, no amount of social intercourse and experience would give him the sense of *duty* to God and Man,—that duty which is the essence of Right and Wrong. Such a Person would go through life with the same moral outlook as a crocodile.

Now, as I have said, it is not the purpose of this book to discuss the philosophy of Personality. All I wish to indicate is the immense essential spiritual community that exists between all men. We may differ, as individuals, widely from each other; but these differences are in reality superficial. The only real differences are moral. Professor Benjamin Kidd has been foremost in showing us how Social Heredity (*i. e.* the inheritance by a Community of certain Laws, Religion, Social Custom, facilities for reading, writing and enumeration, etc.) is the principal, if not exclusive, cause of the intellectual differences between communities. The point I wish to emphasize is that the common Personality of all Men underlies and altogether outweighs any of the existing differences between them,—let those be differences of race, nation, class, occupation or whatever else. This common Personality enables us all to understand each other, and in our ordinary correspondence with our earthly environment to understand the World in a manner common to all. All of us have the same power of self-consciousness, the same power of being able to conceive for ourselves the relations and meanings of things, and of making “concepts” of our

Again, we come into the world with the Beauty idea, which only awaits the proper circumstances for it to become realized. Suppose a man born with no latent idea of Beauty whatever,—such a person might have boundless impressions of beautiful things, but for him there would still be no beauty, but only, as far as Beauty is concerned, uninterpreted meaningless objects. As with Beauty so with Reason—no number of impressions would evoke Reason in an individual unless the Reason were already a constituent of the Personality. An idiot might have endless impressions, but the world would still be to him without Reason, and he himself would still be an idiot.

Common to all men again is the Geometrical and Mathematical idea. We could, as we have seen, imagine even the Laws of Nature to be other than they are. It is true that if one Law was altered in our existing world, all other Laws might have to be altered also to suit—that is to say, if we were to retain a thinkable and constructive Universe, namely, a Universe in which there were no contradictions. But while this is so, and while it is true we can imagine everything to have been other than it is, the abstract ideas of space and number are of those latent ideas with which Human Personality comes gloriously into the world.

There are many capacities with which Personality as Personality is endowed, but we will here only produce one more instance.

We are all created with the idea of Right and Wrong; that is to say, that we all realize that in whatever thought or act Will is concerned, Right and Wrong are involved. It is true that the various *interpretations* of Right and Wrong—that is, the particular applications of that idea to the varied detail of Life—will vary according to the Social Heredity (i.e. the upbringing and moral and intellectual environment) of different individuals and communities. There are good and lofty moral environments or Social Heredities, and also some that are comparatively bad and

If a man really does not believe, on grounds of immediate self-knowledge, that he is a Person, that behind his various qualities, functions, abilities and achievements there lies the "I," unifying his own life, and making a union between himself and all other men ; if he really believes that he is only a sentient automaton with no free will and no responsibility, it is because in wantonness he chooses to do so, and no argument can affect him

But leaving such persons on one side, it still remains, as I have indicated, that our belief in our Personality, Free Will and Divine relationship, while it receives *corroboration* from philosophy, has its true foundation in our *knowledge of ourselves* and in our own self-consciousness.

We all know when we come to the practical affairs of life that we have Free Will, and that that is of the very essence of our realized Personality, that it is the breath of our Spirits, and that without it there is no true Manhood. Constantly one may hear materialists, who, of course (in theory), repudiate the notion of Free Will, criticizing severely the actions of their contemporaries, attributing therefore to them moral responsibility. They even go further and will execrate (perhaps very justly) certain persons who are dead and gone. Leaving on one side the fact that these persons had according to the materialistic theory no moral responsibility while they were alive, we have the added absurdity that if there is no such thing as Personality surviving after death, and therefore no *permanent* responsibility, these critics are execrating a mere idea or fancy in their own brains, and nothing more.

* * * * *

We must now ask ourselves why it is that the fact of Personality being common to all men should in any way *unite* men ; and why it is that a Person merely because he is a Person should feel himself in duty bound to respect all other Persons as he respects himself, and to do his utmost to secure to them the enjoyment of that Free Will,

many and fleeting sensations received by varied means. In addition to other similarities, all of us have Free Will ; all are in reciprocal relation with the Infinite, and all have a sense of the existence of an abstract Right and Wrong, and consequently all have a sense of moral responsibility. With this common human inheritance, vast, profound, altogether transcending the confines of our comprehension, we may well agree that the difference between the highest type of man or highest individual and the lowest, is as nothing compared with the impassable abyss that separates the lowest type of man from the highest animal. Especially will this be evident to us if we consider the *potentialities* of men. We know, for instance, that given the conditions and the influences, the most barbarous men can become ensamples of goodness, and we know that to be still more emphatically true, in the case of children, little barbarians,—who have, while still very young, come under ennobling and educative influences. These appear to grow up as "civilized," virtuous and capable as do the children of Western civilization. Let us ever remember that while we always see wild animals at their very best, without an ability, talent or virtue undeveloped or unrealized,—among men in almost all cases (I refer especially to barbarous peoples) the reverse is the case. At present we can see only that which is, not that which could be and perhaps shall be.

So far we have dealt with the all-important question of the Personality or Spirituality of Man in a philosophical and speculative manner. To such speculations, however, we should attach but secondary importance ; not because we consider them to be untrue or valueless, but because any argument regarding Personality involves an already existing idea or conception of Personality. This idea is part of our spiritual nature and equipment and cannot be originated or supplied by philosophy, which latter is limited to bringing to the idea intellectual support and light.

Person I am compelled to admit that "You" are a Person also, and that you are entitled to make the same claims on account of your Personality as I make on account of mine, and, further, I am morally compelled actively to support you in your claims. Modern philosophers (among them Kant and T. H. Green) demonstrate to us that if Human Personality exists, it must be universal or common to all men. We can say with Professor Illingworth that Personality as we understand it is universal in its extension or scope—that *is, it must appertain to every human being as such.*

It is upon this great and solemn truth that Democracy is based. Note that I say "Democracy"—not "Popular Government." The two things are not the same. Democracy involves the idea of the equal Right of *all* men; not only of the section in power. It means that the moral Right of the individual Man, whether he belong to the majority or not, is the limitation and the guide of the State in its use of coercive Force; so that, whatever the form of Government, the *whole* people may be said to rule. Essential Democracy can flourish under a great variety of forms of Government.

Popular Government—no more than any other form of Government—necessarily involves the conception of the equal sanctity of all Persons as Persons, *i.e.* a sanctity which should be respected whether the Persons belong to a powerful faction in the State, or whether they are politically powerless.

The truth that Personality "must pertain to every human being as such," is the Democracy of the Christian Faith, and the moral ground or foundation for that most precious of all political boons: universal individual or Personal Liberty.

Personality furthermore involves the idea that all beings who are endowed with Personality are Ends in themselves. In wonderful agreement with Christian teaching, modern

Judgment, Self-control and Self-disposition which are essential to Personality, and are their Right. There is only one answer, and that is the one delivered to us by the Christian Faith, namely, that human beings are related to the Absolute Being as are human offspring to a human parent. Now a child is the product of its parents, and yet notwithstanding this unity with its parents, it is endowed with a Personality or Individuality of its own. That is to say, that if we would understand the matter aright, we must bow to the mystery of parenthood. The more we penetrate into Truth the more shall we perceive that Truth involves opposites, though, of course, not contradictions. Thus if a surface is concave it must also of necessity be the exact opposite, namely, convex. A common saucer, for instance, involves these opposites. So it is possible for a Person to be "one" with another Person and yet be an individual and self-determined being. Innumerable illustrations of these opposites constituting a Truth might be adduced. In some such way therefore as children are the product of, and inherit from, their earthly parents, and yet at the same time are possessed of independent Personalities, so is Mankind the creation, and inheritor of the attributes, of the Absolute Divine Person, and yet is possessed of (contingent) Personality and Free Will.

Men have therefore in common a Divine element which unites them, namely, Personality, expressing itself in Self-consciousness, Free-Will and Judgment. They are not united by mere *similarities* of qualities or of function or physical origin, for these things when analysed leave the individuals of a species wholly independent of each other, and wholly individual; but they are united by a common *relation*, namely, the Divine Sonship, and the *consequent* common spiritual attributes and abilities, which common attributes, qualities and abilities unite them together—not in themselves—but as expressions of a Divine element common to all men. Now, if I am a

Pagans had no effective notion of Personality. Indeed it took many generations of the Christian Faith before the full meaning of the Christian ideal of Personality was discerned, and pagan ideas were eliminated. Consider the pagan Greeks,—a people in many intellectual respects superior to ourselves,—how even their most enlightened men, such as Aristotle, regarded slaves as being nothing more than “living machines.” Consider again how the absence of the conception of a substantively equal Personality caused the Greeks to take a low view of Woman. For Women were regarded even by Aristotle as merely Nature’s failures to produce Men. Among other pagan Nations the ideal of Woman was still lower, as low if not lower than it is among the Mohammedan and heathen nations to-day. The latest view, namely, that of German materialistic utilitarians and the Bolshevists in Russia, is probably one of the lowest.

To the Christian, as regards Personality, there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female. Whatever sex, class or nation a Person belongs to, Christians are bound to recognize him as morally and essentially one with themselves. It is a Unity and an Equality in and through differences. If we read the history of pre-Christian social conditions and compare them with normal modern conditions this will be apparent. It must be admitted, however, on the other hand, that in the last few years, with the growth of materialism and atheism, a certain class of wage-earners has been set against all other citizens, so that they do not regard these other citizens as Human and endowed with equal rights of life and liberty with themselves,—as we see in the case of the absolutist Socialists and Bolshevists. We see the same principle at work in the case of the materialistic militarists of Germany. Thus we are credibly informed that the Kaiser used to say, that as far as he was concerned, morality ended at the Rhine; while German militarists have propounded the

philosophy, especially that of the School of Kant, has shown us that all persons in virtue of the Free Will essential to the existence and even the very idea of Personality, are *ends in themselves*, and never merely means to other ends. This Free Will or Self-determination as it is called, this ability of becoming, and this claim to be a law to themselves, is essential to them as *personal* beings, as beings, *i.e.*, who are *more* than mere impersonal organisms. They are compelled by the Law and Nature of their Being to regard themselves as Ends, "ultimate objects of endeavour or development," and to make a similar claim on behalf of all other of their fellow-men on account of their similar Personal nature. Personal beings may, of course, deliberately and of their own Free Will sacrifice themselves for other Persons, but they may never be converted, as if they were impersonal things, into mere instruments of another Person's will, or the will of a group of Persons, or of a political party or community.

Now the belief that the Absolute is a Person and that from Him men derive their Personality, and that He is in a relation to men (and in spite of all things which would seem to militate against this relation) not less than that of a Father (as we use that word in our ordinary human life), is of Christian origin, as also is the belief that inevitably follows from it, that each individual, while indeed a member of a State, must transcend his relation to the State, being related and responsible to a Power beyond it. It is, of course, true that many people hold these truths who are not definitely Christians, but they should remember that this their belief is due to their Christian social heredity, their Christian environment, and that were the Christian Religion to become extinct among those who hold it, the Christian social heredity, the Christian environment which in reality supports them, would fade away, and the World would again be left with its old pagan ideas.

practice between Christians and non-Christians. We should nowadays regard slavery (i.e. the deprivation of the Individual of his Right to self-ownership) as most immoral, and that in spite of any economic, political or other utilitarian arguments in its favour. Again, we should now consider it highly immoral to torture a man's employees or indeed any witnesses in order to get evidence as a matter of "Utility", nor should we think of torturing accused Persons in order to compel them to assert guiltiness. We would never in the speculative interest of the "Good of the State" expose children to the weather, so that the (supposed) weaker ones should die. We would never turn our tax-collectors loose among the people with permission to wring from them what they could, provided they handed over to the State the amount the State had prescribed. Again, even the State cannot deprive anybody of life or property unless after a public trial he can be shown to be in the wrong, or that the money was in justice due from him. Still less in a State influenced by Christian morality can powerful individuals deprive others of life or money—with or without trial. The greatest Prelate, the most powerful Baron is nowadays no more powerful in such regards than is his valet or groom. Persecutions for the "Good of the Church" or other Religious Body are also now impossible.

But the most important thing to note is how men's whole social outlook has changed. Thus our view of manual workers or of servants. Nobody now pretends that because he is superior by breeding, intellect or wealth to those in a humbler social position, that therefore he is superior morally or in the eyes of the gods. Again, reverent pity and sympathy for the sick, the deformed, the poor, for ill-used or orphan children, the stupid, the ignorant and for all other sorrowful conditions of Men, is the outcome of the Christian perception of the infinite value of each individual Person, whatever may be the

dogma that weaker nations should always be destroyed by the stronger, and that when conquered they should have nothing left but eyes to weep with, a principle they carried out in Belgium and Serbia. By "weaker" nations the Prussian does not mean weaker in virtue or in valour, but weaker in numbers or in wealth.

The absence of the Christian perception of the fact that every man, woman and also child is a transcendental, Divinely-related Person, caused the pagan ideal of men to differ from the ideal of Christians (and those in sympathy with them and influenced by them) at almost every point. One or two more of these points may here be mentioned as examples of this fact. Take, *e g*, the tendency to Absolutism among rulers and the powerful men of pre-Christian days. By Absolutism is here meant *government without reference to the sanctity and right of the individual; especially without reference to his right to life and liberty*. Christian Absolutism was for the main part tempered by Christian ideas, and tends under Christian influence to disappear altogether, but seldom do we meet in Christian countries or in Christian History with the arrogant, insolent, wholly unscrupulous Absolutism of pagan Monarchs. Abundant instances of this type of Absolutism can be found in pre-Christian Eastern History and in the Histories of many of the Roman Emperors and the Khans, and many other pagan Histories. It is true that in Christian History, though to an ever-diminishing degree, we find unscrupulous and arrogant absolutists, but none can say that such Absolutism is typical of Christian ethics, that it is expressive of such ethics, or in any way results from them. In fact, unmoral Absolutism, and indeed any Absolutism, exists not as a result of Christianity, but in spite of it. The pagan conception of Man, on the other hand, was bound to lead up to non-moral or immoral Absolutisms, whether monarchical, military or popular.

The following are one or two instances of difference in

ruling and controlling The present anti-democratic system of imposing Laws (Laws which are to affect the whole people) by means of a bare majority of the people, or rather of the M.P.'s, must surely cease if there is to be any real popular Government or any real Democracy. The matter is made worse when we consider how generally these majorities are fictitious, the outcome of log-rolling and bargains Thus "disestablishers" would vote with the Radicals for Home Rule, if the Radical party, including Home Rulers, would vote for Disestablishment.

* * * * *

We now move on to the consideration of the claim, made by absolutist Socialists, that *the Person is the creation of the State and is therefore the absolute property of the State, that he has no self-ownership and is in no sense an End in himself* The Person with his reciprocal Divine relation, his self-determination (*i.e.* his free will), his conscience, his judgment and power of *deliberate* (as opposed to *instinctive*) action, is not and could not be a "product of the State," as Socialists are so fond of asserting So far from the Person being the product of the State, it is the State that is the product of the Person Personality, it is true, is partly *realized* in the State, but it is not *created* by it Without Human Personality there could be no self-conscious or deliberate State, and therefore no Laws made or actions performed in accordance with, and as a result of, conscious Reason and Will. We must, of course, admit that organized communities may exist without Personality or Consciousness or Will being attributable to the members Of such are ants' nests, beehives, or even certain kinds of flowers, and the co-operative leaves on trees But such communities are obviously not States in the human sense None of the individual members, for instance, demand (occasionally in irresistible fury) Liberty as the first condition of their lives. None have set their face as a flint against being forced into

accidents of his present condition, and whatever even may be his faults. On every hand Churches,—with all the helpful work that goes on in connection with them,—also hospitals, schools, colleges, in olden times monasteries, Red Cross to mitigate the horrors of war, countless daily secret acts of love and mercy, and many other things, all bear witness to the changed social outlook, the new view that Man takes of Man, and to the birth of a new world.

Personality and its willing recognition by all of us, is, let us repeat, the only real, permanent foundation of Democracy. We are pleased with "Popular Government" and sometimes confuse it with Democracy. But it must never be forgotten that Popular Government can be as absolutist as that of any despot. Thus political majorities (often composed of a number of log-rolling minorities—mere conspiracies) will say that they represent the *people*,—though even when genuine they very rarely represent noticeably more than half and sometimes less; and they will pass measures disliked by a large section of the people.

Now all this is contrary to the whole idea of Christian Democracy. Rather should those in power aim at securing that minimum of Law and social arrangement upon which the people *as a whole* are agreed, than strive by force or trickery to impose upon their fellow-citizens that maximum which they themselves desire. The Bolsheviks (anti-religious and materialistic as they are), who prated of Popular Government and Democracy, were, it appears, not long ago killing and torturing people that were their own fellow-citizens at an incredible rate—and this not because these others had done any wrong, but merely because they did not accept the Bolsheviks' theories. If the Bolsheviks cared a straw about Democracy, they would see to it that the people *as a whole* rules, and that only that amount and kind of measures were passed which would suit the people *as a whole*, so that it could be truly said that the *demos*, and not merely a dominating section of it, was

would be moral responsibility, the ultra civic or Divine relation, and all Personality or possibility of it.

Under such conditions he would conform to the absolutist Socialist ideal (the ideal also of all absolutists) that *the significance of the individual is exhausted in his relation to the State*

Personality then is not miraculously "created" by the State, but it is realized and finds its self-expression in the State. That is to say, the State or civic relation is one of the *many* social relations through which Personality develops itself

It is a great error to speak of the State as if it included in itself all social relations. The State or civic relation is, of course, only *one* of these relations, for our relations with each other are only civic or State-regarding when we are acting specifically as citizens; when, that is to say, we are voting, serving on Government Bodies, paying taxes, serving on juries, working as civil servants, soldiers, sailors, police, etc. But the main part of the lives of most of us is made up of relations and actions which are not civic, and in regard to which we cannot be said to be acting specifically as citizens. In the matter of such relations and actions we neither deny nor assert citizenship—that being a thing apart. There are, as a moment's reflection will show, numbers of relations besides those we call civic; and it is these relations which constitute the main part of our social life. Personality, *i e*, is realized through our social life as a *whole*, and not only through that part of it we call the civic relation. Let us consider a few instances of relations and actions which are not civic or State-regarding. Thus when a mother kisses her child, the action is not civic, nor is she acting specifically as a citizen. Again, the relation of the Family is not civic. We may, furthermore, be compatriots or fellow-members of a Race or Nation—a relation of the highest importance as constituting the basis or material of the State. We may

becoming mere means to an End—mere parts of a machine or organism. None are determined that at all costs they will be Persons. None prefer starvation, persecution and death to security and ease purchased at the cost of Freedom. The actions of the individuals of such communities are automatic, and the Reason that controls and guides them must be looked for *outside* them, and especially is this evident when we regard the wonderful doings of certain kinds of plants.

Unlike the bee or the ant, which claim no affinities beyond their own community and beyond the Earth, Man is a being of both Earth and Heaven. He is not a mere member in an organism, he is also a transcendent Person and an End in himself, and, unlike the ant and the bee, is compelled by his innermost spiritual nature to claim Liberty for his soul and for the souls of all the children of God.

Were this otherwise, our social problems would be easy of solution. Force could be used by the dominating section to any extent to "impose their will" upon the rest, in the supposed or alleged interest of the "Good of the State." Against such use of Force there could be no protest; at any rate no protest based on the sense of a Wrong committed and a Right violated—the only kind of protest that leads to anything. It is only for *men* that there is a Magna Charta and other similar assertions of a spiritual life. Among other communities where there is no Personality the individual could make no moral claims, nor could he even desire to do so.

In brief the ant or the bee is admittedly the product of its State. But if a man (and this is a truth of great importance) were in regard of his Personality the mere product of his State or his social environment in general, he would necessarily be wholly "determined" (*i. e.* wholly conditioned and exclusively actuated) by that environment, to the total exclusion of Free Will. Excluded also

nor is it the *sole* means to its realization. On the contrary, it only *contributes*, together with a vast number of other relations, towards that realization of Personality and the development of the Manhood of the Individual.

What then is that contribution made by the State, or as we might equally well say—by the Government?

The State uses coercive force, and is therefore limited, if it would be moral, in the range of its activities. It is the same with individuals. A man may use force to protect himself or his neighbour from a murderer or a thief, but he must not use force to compel his neighbour, *e.g.*, to become a Roman Catholic or a Bolshevist. For such purpose he must rely upon persuasion. It is obvious that when we are employing persuasion and honourable inducement, we are restrained by fewer moral limitations than when we propose to use force.

The Contribution of the State, then, towards the self-realization of the Person is to use its coercive powers primarily for the purpose of rendering all other relations (non-civic and spontaneous relations) possible, by rendering possible and secure from trespass, fraud and violence, free intercourse between man and man. In other words, the force of the State, if we would employ it morally, must be used primarily in the interest of the Freedom and self-ownership of the individual Person. Thus and thus only can Force be reconciled with Freedom, and Law with Liberty.

Now to all such teaching all Absolutists are intensely opposed. A Roman Emperor, a Khan, a Kaiser would regard it as contemptible and also dangerous to the "Good of the State," or what they *suppose* to be the good. But the Absolutists with whom we are specially concerned in these days are the absolutist Socialists, and the Bolshevists, who are their logical outcome.

It will be necessary at this point to define what is meant by a Socialist, *i.e.* when we give the word any clear, specific meaning at all: the term being generally used without

also be relations or friends ; or we may be lawyers, teachers, tradesmen, manual labourers, clergymen, fishermen, actors, writers—the list is endless It is through these and innumerable other free social relations and activities that Personality realizes itself, developing into full consciousness that individual responsibility, self-development, self-control, self-determination which are among its essential characteristics.

Every effort is now being made by the Bolsheviks in Russia, and Socialists elsewhere, to compel the whole of life, even the most private and spontaneous relations, into the category of civic or State regarding relations. Children are to be the property of the State, Women are to be handed over brutewise to the State also, and writers and speakers must only write or speak what the State tells them—and endless other evils But this is not the place to give a list of or to discuss the immoralities, brutalities and horrors that must always attend the socialization of all human life, the absorption, *i e*, by the State of all human relations, and the conversion of them all into the mechanical civic relation

The object of it all is to enable atheists and materialists (the Bolsheviks and true Socialists have stamped upon all religion) to convince the rising generation that they are the slaves of the Government (*i e* of that section of the Community which has the domination), and that beyond the Government they have no affinity, no Divine kinship, no love and no hope They are to learn that for them there is no Free Will, no conscience, no self-chosen ideals, no worship, no *self*-development. For them is to be no romance, no wife and child, and no home. This at any rate is the scheme of the devotees of Socialization, the thing that they are working for, the thing for which in some countries they are daily torturing and slaughtering their fellow-men, even their fellow-citizens.

We see then that the State does not create Personality

One might as well say that the Police Force is Socialistic. But a thing is not socialistic merely because it is undertaken by the Government. Whether the thing is Socialistic or not will depend upon the End or Ideal the Government has in view. If the aim is to oust and suppress the individual Person, then the undertaking is socialistic; if the reverse is the case, the Government's action is presumably Personalistic—that is, in favour of the development, the moral claims and the characteristics of the individual Person. The Police, for instance, aim primarily at the protection of the individual Person in the enjoyment of his Liberty and Right. The Navy aims at preserving to him his Nationality, which is the spiritual environment of Personality and a principal source of its realization and development,—as is sorrowfully admitted by Socialists themselves. So here are two prominent institutions conducted by the Government, and neither are Socialistic nor Communistic.

Again it is evident that English people constantly call themselves Socialists, because they think that the only alternative is Individualism in the old bad sense of “each one for himself, and the devil take the hindmost”—a materialistic doctrine more familiar, happily, to the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries than it is to us. To this the English have a very strong and very proper objection.

There is, however, a third and more hopeful and truer position, as we shall see before we have done.

We have seen that a person can be *social* without holding any communistic theories of any kind. Wherefore it is important to remember that the adjective belonging to the word Socialist is not “social” but “socialistic”—a very different matter.

The only socialism with which this argument deals, and which is now being defined and described, is Absolutistic Socialism, i. e. Socialism unqualified, consistent and logical. It will be well, therefore, to pause for a moment to define what is meant by an Absolutist.

any particular signification. At the same time and in connection with this, a few other terms which are being used in this argument, and which are constantly employed with great vagueness and confusion, will require definition also.

The Socialist, then, is not, as is commonly supposed by trusting and unanalytical persons, merely another name for a philanthropist or benevolent individual. We are always told that the word Socialist is derived from the Latin *socius*, meaning a friend. Let anyone who takes this roseate view, and who yet is not a definite, logical Socialist, in the sense in which the genuine unqualified Socialist uses the word, let such an one see how much "friendliness" these people will exhibit, say in Germany or in Russia, to anyone who differs from them even by a hairbreadth. Imprisonment, nameless torture and a frightful death are about all the trusting investigator will get for his pains, *to*, when and if the Socialists or Communists are in sufficient force.

Nor is a Socialist merely a person who is "social." A man can be social without being "socialistic," at any one point. If he marries or joins a Church or a Club or a Society, if he helps the poor, or promotes reforms, or even if he dines with a friend instead of dining alone, so far he is social, but not necessarily socialistic. Thanks to the kindly wisdom of the English, most of the people here who consider themselves Socialists, Communists, etc., though there are many and dangerous exceptions, are so with such a number of moral reservations that they would do better to call themselves simply social Reformers, along with other people. In discussion with these pseudo-Socialists, I habitually find that they have never defined to themselves what they mean by Socialism, and have no notion how it differs from other political philosophies. They have a vague notion that a thing is socialistic if it is done by the Government. A Socialist once told me that the Navy was Socialistic because it was conducted by the Government.

consistent and faithful to his specific doctrines. *So far* as a person does *not* do this he is not a Socialist, and *so far* as a person does do this, whatever he may call himself in general, he is so far an Absolutist of some sort—in these days presumably a Socialist.

And, furthermore, if a person adopts Socialistic principles at one point, it is impossible to see why or where he should stop. We cannot assert a principle one minute and deny it the next. We cannot, *e.g.*, deny Personality at some point where it pleases us to do so, and proceed to assert it in regard to other matters which we consider unimportant or in which we are not interested. Thus we cannot claim *religious* Freedom for the individual on the ground of the sanctity of Personality, and then deny that same Personality by abolishing, on grounds of supposed "utility," the moral claim men make, on the strength of that same Personality, to, say, Freedom of Speech, or the Right to speak and teach their own language.

True Socialism then, in the only specific, definite sense of the word, differs from Humanitarianism, Philanthropy, Christian Socialism and mere amiability (with which it is constantly confounded to the great convenience of Socialists themselves) in that it asserts that the power of the Government—provided it be Socialistic—is absolute, unlimited and unmoral. So we see that the word Socialist does not mean vaguely a benign person who wants every one to be happy, but it has, and its most zealous devotees here agree, a definite, intelligible and specific or *exclusive* meaning.

One would have thought that the European experience in the last two years, and the contemplation of what logical Socialism leads to, would have made the absolutistic character of true Socialism abundantly evident. The marked tendency to despotism of certain of our own Trade Unions would alone indicate this.

Treitschke tells us that the State is Power, and that it has no Power to limit its Power, hence no treaty when

An Absolutist is one who desires, as far as his power permits, to rule without any reference to, or regard for the sacred claim to Liberty made by the individual on the ground of his free will, liberty, conscience and his ultra-civic relation with the Supreme Being, made, in short, on the ground that as a Person and not a Beast, he is an "End in himself"

All this claim of the individual Person is wholly denied by the true Absolutist; the dogma of the Absolutist being that "the significance of the individual is exhausted in his relation to the State." As against the State, the individual, according to this doctrine, can set up no moral claim, and unless he is strong enough to use force he cannot hope for hearing or redress. The State, too, or rather for all practical purposes—the Government, becomes the ultimate imponent of duty, and its dictates the sole source and criterion of Right and Wrong.

It is evident from this that there can be many different kinds of Absolutists. We may have Absolutism in the form of Monarchy, Oligarchy, Militarism, Socialism, Bolshevism, Trade Unionism, and indeed under any form of Government, where the people are unenlightened, helpless or have lost their individual self-respect.

Socialists are always very horrified at the idea of Monarchical or Militaristic Government when these are absolutistic. But there is no difference in actual principle between Despots, Militarists and Socialists. They all hold openly, or in practice covertly, that "the significance of the individual is exhausted in his relation to the State," and that the speculations of those in power regarding the "Greatest Good of the Greatest Number," or the "Good of the State," are for the rest of the people the sole source and criterion of Right and Wrong.

In this argument by "Socialist" is meant, as we have said, an absolutistic Socialist, *i.e.*, one who completely subordinates the individual to the State, and is always

As the communistic ideal of regimentation and mechanical life does not differ *in principle* from the militaristic ideal, so we find that the same principle which underlies Communism or genuine consistent Socialism, also underlies Anarchism. (Some years ago certain police officials were reported as saying that most of the anarchists who passed through their hands had once been socialists.) Nor is the reason for this far to seek.

If we deny the Divine Right of the individual Person, we are compelled in the end to deny the Divine or moral Right of any number of Individuals. If the individual Man has no Right, neither have ten million of such viewed corporately. The justification of coercive Law consists in the fact that by its means the sanctity of the Person may be preserved from force or fraud, and that thus men may learn to respect each other as Personal Individuals; and the constituent elements and characteristics of Personality, Free Will, conscience, moral responsibility, *self-direction*, *self-control* and *self-ownership*, and love itself, may find full scope for their realization and development in the Liberty of the Person, that Liberty in which alone a spiritual being can realize itself and its Divinity.

In the interest, then, of Personality and attainment of its Freedom, the Society is justified in resorting to coercive Law, *i.e.* Force. Force thus used is compatible with Freedom, and is indeed essential to its maintenance. The Government of such a Society rules by Divine Right, which itself is based upon and derived from and reflects the Divine Right of the Personal individuals constituting the Society.

If, however, there is no such thing as transcendental Personality with *a priori* moral or Divine Right, then there is no such thing as a Government with a moral Right to rule. Any Government that existed under such conditions would exist, not by an admitted moral Right, but merely by the sheer physical force of those in power.

it becomes inconvenient can be binding ; hence general arbitration is absurd, etc. Now Treitschke was an Absolutist, though not a socialistic one. But he and the true Socialists have the same principles. Naturally neither in the view of Militarists nor Socialists has the State "any power to limit its power," if the one thing that could limit it, namely, a general belief in the Divine Right of Man, is cast out and trampled under foot

No Monarch and no other kind of Rulers (with the exception of Militarists and Socialists), however great their power, need in actual practice act as Absolutists ; nor could they, morally speaking, be regarded as Absolutists, if in all that they do they are inspired and restrained by reverence for the Personality and consequent Personal Liberty of all Persons in the Community, whether they belong to the majority or only the smallest minority.

It is, however, of the essence of all communistic theory that it be anti-individualistic, in every sense of the word, and in conflict with the whole teaching of Personality and Liberty. One of the rights or liberties first attacked is the Liberty to possess, *i. e.*, the Right to make, to save and to contract.¹ But it is very soon found, and here friend and foe are agreed, that you cannot abolish private property till you have abolished the Family, which, as all parties agree, is as it were the spiritual *modus* of Personality, or the "hotbed of Individualism," as certain Socialists have described it. With the abolition of the Family, Religion has to vanish also ; and so the flame spreads from one thing to another till men become little better than so many slaves or mules.²

¹ It may be suspected, however, that the attack on the Right or Liberty to possess private property is in many cases merely a "blind" devised by militant atheists and anarchists to conceal a general attack on all Personality and Right, and the whole transcendental element in the Individual and the Society.

² Innumerable instances of this exist,—the latest is that the Bolsheviks are introducing martial law into their factories, etc.

as any moral principle was concerned they could, had it suited their fancy or their interest, have become Socialists or Anarchists

So repulsive are Individualists of this type, that in a previous book I ventured to coin the word "Personalist" in order to avoid any possible confusion between the view of the Individualists who believe in Personality and the view of the kind of Individualists who are openly or covertly materialists,—to avoid, that is, any confusion between the "each for himself" and "devil take the hindmost" kind of person and the moral Individualist or Personalist who regards the Personality and Liberty of all others as equally sacred as his own, and claims nothing for himself as an *a priori* moral necessity of Personality which he does not feel himself bound to secure equally for all other Persons. Thus demanding real, genuine Liberty for himself, he will not be content that his neighbour should have only a Liberty which is theoretical and largely fictitious. He repudiates many of the doctrines popular in the days of the materialistic Individualists

Having now defined and described Socialism and its affinities and also its contrasts, it will be well to define another word which has been already much used in this argument, namely, "State," and for purposes of clearness also to define one or two other words which are often regarded as having the same meaning as the term "State."

The "State" is only an abstraction. This does not involve that we are not justified in using the expression, but it does involve that when using it we realize that it is merely an abstraction with which we are dealing. We must not therefore "personify" the State or think of it as though it had an independent existence. There are innumerable other abstractions which we employ all day long. Thus when we speak of ethics or moral ideals, we speak of the "Beautiful," the "Good," the "True,"

A Government, however, which cannot claim Moral or Divine Right as its basis, and which does not in its acts appeal to the conscience of the people, to their sense, *i e*, of Right and Wrong, but can only urge in its defence the current speculations of those in power regarding "Utility" or the "Good of the State," has lost its main support; and if the people (as would be the case) share the non-moral or immoral views of their Government, it is impossible to see how Anarchism should fail to arise or fail to succeed.

Now not only can the communistically minded man become an anarchist without deserting his basal principles—his theory that is of the nature of Man—but he can also become a materialistic Individualist. This latter person prated always (and in the shallowest and often most ignorant manner) of "the survival of the fittest" and "natural selection," which in brief mean "the devil take the hindmost." He had also other pretty theories.

A recent elaborate work has shown us the horrors that existed in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in the name of this Individualism. That creed produced more people "unfit" to survive than any other philosophy had so far ever done. The crude notion was that people who got on and made money were more fit to survive. It never occurred to these philosophers that men do not succeed in making money because as men they are more "fit to survive," or that they are more "fit to survive" because they have made money. Ordinarily speaking, people succeed in making money merely because they are as individuals each of some special or unique economic value to the Community. But this value is only relative, and is merely and purely economic, and we cannot and may not judge the value of Persons simply from the point of view of wealth producing efficiency.

Needless to say, the Individualists of the materialistic type referred to had either no belief at all in Human Personality, or no belief which was in the least degree effective; and as far

Lenin, the Kaiser, President Wilson, Malthus, Calvin, Nietzsche, Bishop Westcott, Karl Marx, J S Mill, or the Eugenists, "Christian Scientists," Theosophists, Mohammedans, etc., will abundantly testify.

As it is with "Progress" and other abstractions, so is it with the abstraction we call the State. The State is a number of Persons. These Persons, while they constitute a State, do constitute at the same time the vastly profounder and more substantive thing we know as the *Nation*. The State is the Nation viewed as organized for purposes of Government; that is, it is *one aspect* of the *Nation*. It is from the *Nation* we derive a large element of our individual character, that character, and that particular aggregate of social relations, which the Personality of each one of us finds, as it were, ready to its hand, as its given material to work upon, and as its definite medium for self-realization. Thus it is that we speak of National character and National physical features and never of State character or features—just as *per contra* we speak of State subsidies or State monopolies, and never of National subsidies or monopolies. Horse racing, to take at haphazard another instance, we speak of as a National sport, never as a State sport. The Nation, then, is not the same thing as the State, but it transcends the State as a man transcends any particular one of his functions.

The State, then, is the Nation viewed as organized for purposes of Government; organized also, of course, for purposes of protection from external foes; but this is not of the essence of the matter, nor does it at this moment concern us.

The *Government* is the medium or instrument through which the State at any given moment actually functions. It is the existence of a law-making Government which makes the kind of Nation we call a political Nation,—such as England, France, America, etc. There are many

etc. But we know that, apart from the Absolute Person who is absolutely beautiful, good and true; and apart from the Persons of His creation and in His likeness, there is no moral Beauty, Goodness or Truth. We also speak of Thought and Reason, etc. But we know that, apart from Persons who think and reason, these things do not exist. All are functions, qualities or aspects of the Person, who alone is the concrete reality. "Progress" is another abstraction and a most misleading one. Politicians and others almost invariably talk of Progress as though it were in itself an existence of some sort, concerning the nature and meaning of which there could be no dispute. Meanwhile they themselves do not know what they mean by it. Until we know what the thing is that is to progress and to what it is to progress, the word is meaningless. If, however, we agree that human beings are Persons, and that the ideal at which they must aim is the realization of their Personality (the Progress, *i e*, of the finite and relative Person towards the Infinite and Absolute Person), then "Progress" has a reality and a meaning as a function of Personality. Here we see the Person progressing towards something which is an *absolute* "End in itself" It is commonly supposed that merely getting more machinery and food is progress. But to those who regard men as spiritual beings, these things are not an absolute End, they are at best only means; while to materialists, there being for them no Absolute, there can be no absolute End. For such, therefore, there can be no absolute progress, only change,—pleasant to those who approve of it or benefit by it. When Socialists tell us that there is no real difference among men as to Progress and the End, we shall always find that they have tacitly assumed that food, convenience and pleasure are the End. As a matter of fact, the differences of opinion as to the End, and therefore as to what constitutes Progress, are profound, as the respective adherents of, *e g*, the Pope,

are clear on the subject of Right in the abstract, we are in a fair way to be clear, rational and just on the subject of "rights." Especially perhaps will this clearness be a help to us when we come to consider the now much-disputed subject of the possession of wealth

* * * * *

As men continue to develop and their activities become more numerous and more varied, so will "rights," or the applications to particular cases of the doctrine of Right, become more numerous. Thus the right to religious freedom is not asserted and legalized until men are so developed that they begin each one to think for himself. Again, there can be no such thing as patent right or copyright until men in some considerable number begin to invent or to write, and so to claim protection for their work.

In view of this gradual perception and application of the doctrine of Right, we see the absurdity of the argument that because the particular rights which we now possess did not always exist, that therefore those and all other rights are artificial or non-natural, and have their origin, not in the spiritual nature of Man, but in the State: that the State, or dominating power or party therein, is the sole source and determiner of Right, and can create or abolish rights at its pleasure.

If, however, men are indeed Persons, it is clear that the State cannot give us any moral rights, nor can it take any away. It can only recognize and enforce rights which are claimed by Persons in view of their Personality, or it can refuse to recognize them, or actually oppose them. Meanwhile the rights exist on *a priori* moral grounds. That is to say, a *moral* right can exist though the State refuses to recognize it, and make it also into a *legal* right. Thus the Armenians in Turkey had a moral right not to be killed by the Turks, but it does not appear that they had any legal right.

Magna Charta is often spoken of as having given us

Nations which are not *political* Nations, because they have no Government. Such are the Jews and the Gipsies. These, however, are better called "races," and with such we have here nothing to do. So we see that the political Nation is a body of Persons which is subject to one common coercive Law and Authority; from which it follows that the State (expressing itself through its Government) and the political Nation are necessarily geographically conterminous.

A *citizen* is a Person viewed, not as a whole, but exclusively in his relation to the State or Government, *i.e.* in his *civic* capacity.

It is worth dwelling upon these definitions and distinctions in view of the confused and confusing teaching of modern Absolutists, notably of Socialists and Bolsheviks. The Person is realized through the sum of his relations, of which the State or civic relation is indeed one, —but it is only one. There are, as we have seen, many other social relations; all of which, in so far as they are moral and deliberate, are based upon the all-important ultra-civic and ultra-social relation with the Divine or Absolute Person. If, now, we make the State to mean not merely the State or civic relation, but, in communistic fashion, make it include all relations whatsoever, actual or possible, so that all human relations are regarded as merely civic and terminating in the State, we make the State absolute, and place in its hands the physical power and also the moral right (if under such circumstances "moral right" could have any meaning) to create, destroy or tamper with the whole of the relations and moral rights of the Person.

That we should do this is at present a grave danger; but the danger can be averted, and we shall avert it the more certainly if we refuse to allow the terms Nation and State to be used as interchangeable and as meaning the same thing.

getting the State on our side, *i.e.* by combining together, becoming the dominating faction in the State, and then prostituting the Law for our own purposes. This has frequently happened in history, and happened notably in this country when in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the landlords, mine-owners, manufacturers and Justices of the Peace combined and dominated the State in their own interests.

All that can be said is that a person who infringes a right of his neighbour by permission of the State, commits a lesser wrong than he who does the same thing in spite of the State. Though *per contra* he who, whether as legislator or voter, *causes* the State to infringe a right of his neighbour, commits a double offence, in that he not only injures his neighbour, but he prostitutes the State for his purpose.

* * * * *

The substitution of unbridled speculations regarding the "Good of the State" or the "Good of the Individual" for the known Right of the Person as our guide in matters of Government is doubtless an attractive proceeding, but is a grave and subtle menace to Liberty.

As we have seen, there is no measure of agreement as to what is the "Good of the State" or the "Good of the Individual"; nor as to the *means* which it is permissible to adopt for the attainment of the "Good," when and if that is agreed upon by any two people. Upon such matters Christians, *e.g.*, and those influenced by their morality on the one hand, and materialists on the other, take extremely different views; while each of these two classes of people again differ widely among themselves.

If we believe that Man is only a glorified monkey, and that there is no difference between his State and a beehive, except that the latter is more thoroughly organized, we shall take a very different view of what is the Good of the State and of the Individual, and of how the Good is to be

Right to use his Liberty for the purpose of injuring, diminishing or stultifying the Personality of other Persons ; for to him all Personality being sacred, the claims arising therefrom are also sacred.

Ideally speaking, therefore, the Liberty of each Person is conditioned and limited, as far as coercive Law is concerned, only by the equal Liberty of all other Persons. It is true that this Liberty of the individual must of necessity be greatly modified in times of grave national peril ; but leaving such abnormal conditions on one side, we perceive that it is a main function of coercive Law to protect A from B, and B from A, so that Force ministers to Freedom, instead of militating against it. Thus in a community of A, B, and C, it is not within the moral Right of B and C to combine and coerce A merely in the interest of their speculations regarding the " Good of the community," or the " Good " of A. Their duty is to use the Law for the purpose of protecting each member of the community, including A, in the free use of his judgment and free will, and trust that the Good of the Community (whatever that may be) will follow.

This Freedom of the individual from coercion (except in the interests of the equal Freedom of all other Persons) is the Right of the Man against the State, against, *i e*, any claim to Absolutism (or the unmoral and unlimited use of Force) on the part of the State or of any usurping body of citizens

It is very important to get a clear idea of Right before we begin discussing "*rights*," *i e*. *the applications at particular times and under particular conditions of the doctrine of Right*. Instances of particular "*rights*" are the right to possess, the right to freedom of speech, the right to religious freedom, the right to own one's body, the right to contract, and numbers of minor rights such as copyright, patent right and so forth, which are, as it were, deductions from the general idea of Right. If we

to be for the Good of the Whole. Again, Slavery, even in Christian America, was upheld as being for the Good of the State, and modern materialists, especially in Germany, are again defending it on those grounds.

Slavery, however, was also defended on the ground that it was for the "Good" of the individual slave, just as some even of the worst brutalities of mine-owners and manufacturers, before the days of the Factory Acts, were declared to be in the long run for the "Good" of the victims. An amount of misery would have been saved, had the State of America not attempted to impose upon the individual negro its then notions of his "Good," but had contented itself with using its Force only for the purpose of securing his Liberty or Right, leaving it to the negro to work out his own Good, and trusting that the Good of the Whole would follow.

If those who seek the "Good" of other people, whether as Individuals or Communities, would realize that they themselves are extremely fallible, they might be less eager to employ force. If, further, they would realize that each individual Person is an End in himself, and so must determine and work out for himself his own Good, we should then find the Force of the State (and even the Force of extraneous bodies, as, *e.g.*, Trade Unions) used primarily and mainly in the interest of the Freedom of each and of all

The State, with its mechanical Law and its Force, does not and cannot provide us with the Good of the Whole or the Good of the Individual, nor can it even indicate what that Good is. The State or Government can only *contribute* towards the attainment of the Good, and this, owing to its imperfectly representative character and its methods, it can only do along a certain definite line—that is to say, by making possible, secure and easy the free intercourse and relations between man and man, so that there be no stultifying of Personality by the tyranny

certain rights. All that Magna Charta did, however, was to legalize or obtain the sanction of the State for certain rights which already existed, and which in the course of our development as individuals had come to be perceived and, on moral grounds, definitely claimed.

Moral and legal rights are by no means necessarily the same thing. History is full of records of people who had rights which the State refused to recognize and make legal; which, indeed, it actually opposed with fury, resulting in torture and death to those who claimed the recognition of the rights. Other people, on the contrary, had legal rights which were not moral, as, *e g*, the Christian slave-owners and slave-traders of the United States.

It is evident, therefore, that a thing does not become right merely because it becomes legal. It is common nowadays to hear the proposal that what is at present given to the poorer elements among us in charity and love, should in future be taken from the present voluntary donors by force of Law and thus given to the poor, so that the poorer should be spared the "humiliation" of being in a relation of Christian charity with their fellow-men, and should now receive as a "right" what had hitherto been an expression of fellowship and charity.

Apart from the fact that charity given and received in the right spirit elevates both giver and receiver, we cannot fail to perceive that the mere fact that the State would now by Force of Law obtain and present the money to the wage-earners, would not of itself give the recipients any more "right" to the money than they had before. Whether or no the recipients could ever have been said to have a "right" to the charity which they received, is a question that does not here arise. All we need to assert is that if they had no moral right before the action of the State, they could not have any more moral right after it.

Were this otherwise, there is no immorality which we could not convert into a morality by the simple means of

the case of Persons whose reason is undeveloped or in permanent or temporary abeyance, the State may adopt a course which would be wrong in other cases. As instances of this we may mention the relation of the State to children, and also to the feeble-minded Persons again under the undue influence of alcohol, and still more of certain kinds of drugs, have their reason in abeyance and so also their Personality. The State is therefore entitled to exercise a reasonable control over the sale of things which are easily capable of rendering citizens something less than reasonable Persons, *i.e.* those Persons whose Liberty alone the State undertakes to preserve. The State does not in this matter interfere with the Person in order to make him temperate and virtuous, or to protect him from his own judgment. If such were its motive, the State ought also to prevent people from, *e.g.*, eating and sleeping too much,—modes of intemperance which cause disease as readily as any other indulgence. The reason why a well-ordered State would never interfere with such intemperance is, that the victims thereof retain their reason and remain Persons in the full sense.

The State must not, of course, act so as to preclude the *reasonable* use of wines, drugs, etc., for that would be to suppress the reasonable actions of reasonable people. These latter constitute the great mass of the population; for the great mass is, especially at the present day, temperate.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that however tempting may be this or that suppression of the Liberty of rational Persons, whether that suppression be in relation to the matters we have just considered or any other matter, yet every such interference of A and B with the proper Liberty of C, will constitute a *precedent* for other interferences. The principle of the Liberty of rational beings having been weakly surrendered at one point, is to the logical mind surrendered altogether, *i.e.* as a principle, or

sought, to that which we should take did we believe that each and every man is a divine spirit.

Given this latter belief, we can know more or less what is right, and when we have been wrong all will be eager to correct the error ; while without the belief, we are plunged into a bottomless abyss of speculation, there for ever to "dance upon nothing."

The sorrows of the World are largely due to people trying to "impose their will" upon other people, they are due to pride, in fact. Nowadays this imposing of our will upon others is generally done with the intention of imposing upon others our idea of their "Good" as Individuals or as Communities. Sometimes the people who do this are well intentioned,—as well intentioned as the pride that lurks behind their actions will permit. At other times the "Good of the Individual" or the "Good of the Whole" is a mere pretext. In either case, strife and misery, and very frequently the delay of progress, is the result. The Romans when they persecuted and massacred the Christians supposed that what they did was for the Good of the State. It is true that the Romans had no effective notion of Personality and the consequent sanctity of each Individual, for that was an outcome of Christianity ; but had they been possessed of this idea and had they acted on it, the World would have been spared a shameful spectacle, and a religion which men of practically all schools admit to be the highest and most progressive the World has seen, would have triumphed very much sooner. All through history we find the same story of pride—and anguish. The Bolsheviks to-day, instead of being content to have that minimum of non-party or non-sectarian Law to which all would render willing obedience, are determined to impose upon others, by means no matter how immoral and how frightful, that maximum of party or sectarian Law and Organization which (honestly or dishonestly) they themselves assert

housing problem is intimately associated with the land question. Land, unlike labour or capital, is not a product of Man's Will, and it cannot be increased by him anywhere, let alone in the places where it is most wanted,—if we may be pardoned an absurdity. Again, even if the labourer shifts his quarters he is very likely to find himself in an equally imperfect house. Not being able to make land, or even to build a house if the land were there, his Liberty in the matter of housing is from the nature of things very limited. The State may therefore legitimately come to the aid of the labourer, and while it cannot compel land-owners and builders to build cottages, it can compel them if they do build them to make them as reasonably healthy and conducive to decency as the economic conditions of the time permit. It should also discourage useless and costly regulations in the matter of cottage building; and by education and otherwise, discourage conditions of labour which prevent building from being a *paying business*.

[Incidentally it may be observed that the housing problem would (especially if proper use were made of cheap and swift locomotion) be in a fair way to be solved if the Government, Local Authorities and Trade Unions had not between them made it so expensive to build cottages that it does not pay land-owners and builders to embark on building them. If we were to make cottage building a *paying business*, a sufficient supply of cottages would soon be forthcoming. The only reason that ships, for instance, are forthcoming is that it pays to build them.]

Such regulation of housing and control thereof by the State as is here contemplated does not constitute any real violation of the Liberty of land-owners and builders. For we must ever remember the grounds on which Liberty is based, namely, the sacredness of Personality and of all its claims, and the respect we owe to it. If a man quite avoidably and for lucre's sake takes advantage of the helplessness of another man to impose upon him injurious

of one man over another, or of one section of men over another.

If the people of a State are already rotten, so rotten that they cannot be trusted, no political polity will be of the least use. If, on the other hand, the people are sound, from the gift of Freedom the "Good" will follow of itself in forms as richly varied as they will be unexpected.

For the attainment of the Good we must place our trust elsewhere than in mechanical Law and physical Force. We must look, that is, to the conscience and morality of the people, to their religion, family life, initiative, courage and perseverance, to their *self-discipline* and *self-control*, and above all to that mutual respect in which they must all hold each other if Law and Liberty, the State and the Individual, are to be harmonized. This will involve a kind of education for the children of the people very different in many ways from what (in the State Schools) they are receiving at present.

* * * * *

We must now very briefly consider certain seeming *limitations* upon the Liberty of the Person which are imposed by most civilized Countries, and are now almost unanimously recognized as proper and necessary. Leaving on one side the principal limitation on the Liberty of the Person, namely, the coexistence of an equal Liberty on the part of all other Persons—a matter with which we have already dealt, we perceive that there are certain other necessary limitations imposed by any well-ordered State. These other necessary limitations, however, as will be evident, are more seeming than real.

These seeming limitations arise for the main part from two causes: first, the absence or abeyance of the *reason* of the Person, secondly, the absence of real Freedom of action on the part of the Person.

The State, as we know, is concerned only with Persons, and reason is one of the elements of Personality. In

reduction of profits) the inducement to save and invest, the State should diminish both employment and production, and thus in the end injure the very people it set out to benefit.

* * * * *

Finally, there are a number of things which a State may do which facilitate life without impairing Liberty even seemingly—things upon which we need not here dwell. We may, *eg*, be told that we must drive to the left, instead of all struggling together in the street anyhow. To describe this as an interference with the Freedom necessary to Personality would be a pedantic fiction. It would, on the contrary, merely be a measure designed to enable each individual to carry out his own confessed will and intention with ease and security.

The State may also reasonably protect us from flood, fire, disease, etc. It may again light and buoy our coasts, and make and keep up roads¹ free to all, and many other things can it do to enhance Life and Liberty—things for the main part which private individuals cannot or do not want to do. Thus the State prevents people from dying of hunger. Every one who values the development of Personality desires that people should not starve, and the State is appointed to assist in relieving the needy, because at present there is no less unsuitable instrument for the purpose. The whole situation, however, is very far from ideal. As long, however, as our people have the *right spirit* and are duly *watchful*, and as long as these activities are desired by all alike, and their cost is fairly distributed among all the citizens, no harm will result.

* * * * *

Before concluding this general survey of Liberty and

¹ This, however, does not include Railroads. On ordinary roads a man provides himself at his own cost with the actual locomotive power—legs, motors, or horses, on a Railway this is not so. Free Railways would mean free locomotion as well as a free road.

matter of Right and Wrong. The tyrannical action of A and B would necessarily constitute a precedent, and there would be nothing now to prevent B and C in their turn from depriving the earnest but tyrannical reformer A of some liberty which they consider to be injurious to A or to the State, but which A very greatly values.

So, on the matter would go until the sacredness of Personality and its claims would be entirely lost to sight, and the world would find itself put right back into pre-Christian pagan times.

It will not be, as in Russia, by some sudden but deliberate and decisive action, that we in this country will lose our Liberty, and so make the State absolute and ourselves slaves ; it will be (*i.e.* if we do not perpetually watch against it) by gradual filchings in the name of virtue, hygiene, economics, eugenics and what not. These filchings will as often as not be perpetrated by well-meaning but tyrannical and impatient reformers, who are aiming at achieving the Good, or what they themselves variously regard as such, by short cuts.

Let us now consider the second cause of what at first sight appear to be limitations upon the Liberty of the Individual, namely, those cases where true Liberty does not exist.

There are at the present time large numbers of people whose Liberty in regard of certain things is at the time being theoretical rather than real

We perceive this notably in the matter of housing, both as regards the quantity and quality of houses, especially of those houses designed for the wage-earning and small-salaried classes. In theory, if a labourer finds his house insanitary or highly inconvenient, he can move to another. In practice, this Freedom is much curtailed. He must, for instance, be, generally speaking, near his work, and the number of houses, like the amount of land, is limited in any particular neighbourhood. In fact, the whole

spontaneous and vital, and is at once natural and spiritual. It is not mechanically imposed from without, as would be the relations between the children, and between the children and their custodians, in the Government Institutions with which the more thorough and logical Socialists desire to replace the Family

It is, then, through this vital and spiritual relation with his Family that the human being begins to learn that his relations with his fellow-men are vital and spiritual and by no means a matter of "utility," material advantage or class interest.

It must be noted that all this conscious and unconscious learning of social truth is rendered doubly permanent and effective from the fact that it is absorbed in earliest infancy, when ideas are most vivid and indelible ; and also because it is rooted and grounded in Nature itself, that is, in all truly Human Nature.

Now it is assuredly most evident that there cannot be any Family life without the element of *permanence*. Some Socialists, however, attack the Family nominally on the very ground of the *permanence* of the relations involved. Thus in the "Historical Basis of Socialism" we are told that "marriage, *i.e.* in the German Christian sense of marriage for life and responsibility for the children born in wedlock, is almost at an end even now. Divorce and habitual use of prostitution among men of the upper and middle classes are but symptoms of the complete change which is going on among the mass of the people . . . The Socialist tendencies are clearly developing themselves, and the next stage in the development of the human race must be a widely extended Communism" (P. 451)

William Morris and Mr. Bax, in attacking the permanence of the Family relation, seem to desire to make it appear that they do this in the best interest of the Family itself. Thus in "Socialism, its Growth and Outcome" (p. 299), we read: "No binding contract would be

conditions, he has, in regard of that, no respect for or belief in the sacredness of Personality. But the claim to Liberty, by whomsoever made (including, of course, land-owners and owners of building leases), is based upon that transcendental view of the Person, so that no one can claim as a moral Liberty or Right to do anything which demonstrably and as a matter of ascertained fact is by universal consent agreed to be injurious to the welfare of the Person. I say "as a matter of ascertained fact," because it is now the fashion among doctrinaire people with panaceas, to pretend to trace all social evils to the non-adoption or insufficiently drastic application of their respective doctrines and panaceas. Prominent among such people are the Henry Georgites, Teetotallers, Socialists and Eugenists.

The argument in behalf of legal regulation that apphes in the case of landlords and builders applies equally to those who own factories or mines.

It is even possible that the legalized "Minimum Wage" has something to be said in its favour. For this Wage is but an effort on the part of the State to prevent the unorganized wage-earners from perpetually underselling each other in the matter of their labour. In this matter the individual labourer is entirely helpless. It is impossible, for instance, for him to prevent a body of Poles from arriving in the East End of London, and (by underbidding the existing labourers) in the end reducing the wages in this or that industry over a whole district.

In all matters, however, of State interference with wages or with conditions of housing and labour, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that improvements in these directions must be subject to the economic conditions of the time, which should be studied honestly and dispassionately, lest by making production too expensive, and by dissipating in wages, etc., money which would otherwise have been accumulated as capital, and by diminishing (through

vironment of Personality and a main cause of its realization. But just because it is that, it is also the origin, foundation and life of the specifically human organization we call the State. We could, of course, be organized without our being Persons, as are bees, but in that case the organization would not be a political State made by and constituted of free moral agents. It would not be composed, that is, of Individuals who while members of a Community are also Ends in themselves. In a non-Personal Community the Individual is not an End, but a mere means to an End, an End not chosen by himself, and unknown to himself.

The State then finds itself based upon and dependent for its moral force upon the Family. The function, therefore, of a wise State is, as history shows us, to secure its own bases, of which the Nation is one and the Family the other. It is for this reason that all healthy normal States have aimed and (with the exception of the extreme Socialistic or Bolshevist State of Russia) still aim at securing the safety and permanence of the Family,¹ and resort to legal Force to control the Individual for this purpose.

The absolutist Socialists desire to destroy the Family as being a "hotbed" of that Individuality or Personality which, while it gives direction and inspiration to the activities of the State, unquestionably limits its powers.

There is, however, another Socialistic objection to the Family, and that is, that it is an incentive to the accumulation of wealth, and that indeed it was originally "instituted" for this purpose.

¹ The Family has many forms at different times and places, but the principle that the State is as much concerned as the Individual is almost universal. The type of marriage which Christianity has developed is undoubtedly the highest. Christian monogamous marriage involves the principle that while the woman gives herself wholly to a man (as in Oriental marriage), the man on his part also gives himself in an exclusive sense to that one woman. In this specifically Christian form of marriage the Christian ethic indicates, as always, the essential equality of Persons.

Right, it is imperative that we consider, with whatever brevity, that active spiritual environment of Personality which we call the Family and the Nation.

It is the one point of common agreement between Personalists, materialistic Individualists and Socialists (*i.e.* the people who are Socialists in a defined, specific sense) that there can be no State Absolutism, and therefore no compulsory Communism, while the Family and the Nation exist. One prominent reason for this is that the Family and the Nation are the principal causes of the realization of Personality and Individuality, the realization, *i.e.*, by the Person that he is a Person, not a mere unit in a whole of which he is nothing more than a part, and by which he is wholly determined. These two profound vital social relations teach him that he is related to his fellow-men by eternal spiritual ties, and not by material forces and interests. It is in the spontaneous, instinctive and *natural*, yet conscious and deliberate, human Family that the human being learns through love bestowed upon him and through sacrifices made on his behalf, his value, his *unique* value as something irreplaceable by any other individual. He perceives, in short, that he is more than a mere mechanical unit in a homogeneous mass; that he is, on the contrary, a spiritual being, a Person, eternally an End in himself.

Very early in life does this instinctive love and sacrifice become reciprocal, and the perception of his own Personality or spiritual nature leads him to the perception of a similar Personality in others. In this way the foundation of all good citizenship is laid, for the respect in which we hold our neighbour is related to the respect in which we hold ourselves, so that if we have not a high idea of our own Personality, we shall not have a high idea of the Personality of others, and all good citizenship depends upon the existence of these high ideals.

A human being's relation with his Family is internal,

do not seem to tend towards a monotonous uniformity or homogeneity. Rather do they tend to become more *different*, because the ideas which one Nation takes from another are affected by the character of the borrowing Nation, and produce new and unexpected results. Thus there is more difference to-day between the inhabitants of Northern Europe than there was in the days of Julius Cæsar, and there is more difference now between ourselves and the Americans than there was a hundred and fifty years ago.

The modern Nation is not tribal or consanguineous, but its members are bound together by their Social Heredity, expressing itself in a common character and in a certain sympathy and understanding. This is especially evident in the United States, where people from all races are gathered under one Flag, and are markedly affected by one common Social Influence.

Our Social Heredity constitutes in each of us a large part of our character—as is evident, for instance, when we note the comparative want of character in the true cosmopolitan. This National character common to each member of the Nation does not, however, tend to make all the members alike. For the Personality of each one makes a different use of the Social Heredity, which is, as it were, the material, or rather an important part of the material, which Personality finds ready to its hand, and which it will mould to its own individual purposes. The Personality, that is to say, realizes itself in and through some particular given material, of which the Nation is a part, much in the same way as in the biological world any particular Life realizes itself through a given protoplasm.

As the individual develops, therefore, he emphasizes his Nationality, *i.e.* his spiritual oneness, with his compatriots. Thus we perceive that the Nation unites us along lines that run athwart or cut across those of "class" and class

necessary between the parties as regards livelihood, while property in children would cease to exist . . . Thus a new development of the Family would take place, on the basis, not of a predetermined lifelong business arrangement . . . but on mutual inclination and affection, an association terminable at the will of either party. It is easy to see how great the gain would be to morality . . . There would be no vestige of reprobation weighing on the dissolution of one tie and the forming of another "

Needless to point out how all beauty and romance die at the touch of logical Socialism. Plato, the first great Socialist, actually objected to dramatic poetry, for fear that the contemplation of such high ideals should render the common people ill-disposed towards his socialistic theories.¹ Imagine the cautious raptures of two Socialistic lovers discreetly arranging together in lovers' whispers that their union is only to last until one is tired of the other, or has found some one else more agreeable ! Here at least we are safe from all touch of beauty or romance.

Leaving on one side a sprinkling of abnormal females, it is not to be believed that Woman at any rate would approve this promiscuity, and substitution of a universal system of *faux ménages* for the Home, as, for instance, that is known in England. That it is not approved by the mass of our Men is evident from the fact that Socialists have, it seems, decided not to make in their public speeches any more open attacks on the Family,—not, that is, till the wage-earners have been sufficiently "educated" to enable them safely and profitably to do so

We have seen, then, that the Family is a spiritual en-

¹ These theories involved, among other things, the taking over of all children at birth by the State, the destruction of children born to parents who had passed the age prescribed by the State, and the regulation by the State of all marriages and number of births. Plato, however, it must be remembered, was a Pagan speaking to Pagans

unites us on a strong spiritual foundation, instead of on one which is materialistic, rotten and transient.

Now, if we would have Law and if we would have a State, people must find themselves bound together by some force other than the State. Mere Law cannot unite people, because union among the people as a whole is necessary to the effectiveness of Law.

The force which binds Personal beings in the manner necessary to the existence of the State or Government is Patriotism, or the sense of Nationality and its sacredness. In other words, the Nation is the material of the State, or we may say that, like the Family, it is a foundation of the State. It is also, as we have seen, like the Family, an element in the spiritual environment of Human personality, and these three things act and react on one another.

Hence it is that the people of a Nation are entitled (as we saw in the case of the Family) to use the coercive Force of the State to control individuals in the interest of the preservation of the Nation and of the State, for without the Nation there would be no fully realized Personality, nor would there be any State, and without the State that Liberty essential to Personality (for the maintenance of which each of us is responsible) could not exist.

As coercive Law is used for the protection of the Nation and State from dangers from within, so is it also very properly and logically used for the protection of the Nation and State from national enemies from without.

The protection of the Nation from without involves, of course, the existence of Armies. But armed force, unless it is exclusively in their own hands, is repugnant to the genuine Socialists and Bolsheviks. These speak much of Peace and of the impropriety of fighting, or even of being prepared against, National enemies, but they are not at all indisposed to slaughter to any extent those of their fellow-countrymen who are not in agreement with them. Although possessed of the vote, and having at their dis-

Now that man should accumulate wealth because he has a Family is thinkable, but that he should have a Family in order to stimulate himself to accumulate wealth, is quite unthinkable. So far, however, as the Family incites individuals to the saving and investing of wealth rather than to its dissipation, it shows itself to be of still further advantage to the State, by increasing employment and production.

* * * * *

We must now consider briefly the *Nation* as being the second element in the active spiritual environment of the Person. In the character of each one of us there is a large element which is due to our "Social Heredity." Each of us has also, of course, his individual heredity, *i.e.* things which are congenital or born in him. Of such are, *e.g.*, the shape of a man's nose and the colour of his eyes; or an ability for music, or a tendency to gout. But over and above this is the "Social Heredity," that is to say, that mass of influences transmitted from the common past, that mental and moral environment into which not only the Individual, but his whole generation of compatriots are born. This Social Heredity is a miraculous complex of Law, Language, Custom, Religion, Memories and Ideals, of Art, Literature, Music, etc etc, all with the background of a common History—a History of National heroes, a History of sorrows and of joys, of fears, failures and triumphs. We perceive, moreover, that this is no accidental and meaningless jumble, but is a living Whole evolved by the Providence that rules the World.

This Social Heredity varies greatly from Nation to Nation. It is, moreover, the *significance* of the Nation, and that which holds the members of the Nation together in a common Nationality.

The Nation which has a noble Social Heredity has also a noble mission and a great responsibility. Nations learn from each other, and yet in this process of exchange they

Again, unlike the self-identical Person, the Nation may break into two, each of which may be true Nations, or it may lose its separate individuality by being merged in another Nation. Furthermore, the Nation exists presumably for this world only, nor, even so, do we know how long any particular Nation will exist, nor even whether Nations will be a characteristic of human life to the end of time.

Meanwhile what is clear and indisputable is that the Nation, no matter whose Nation it may be, *while it exists* here and now is real—as real, indeed (if we consider History, especially the most recent History), as anything can be.

It is only by a whole-hearted recognition of this that we can hope for international peace. Each one of us must learn to love and respect his own Nation because he believes in Nations *in general*. We must be patriots because we believe in and respect Patriotism *in general* and wherever we find it. If a man despises and disbelieves in all Nations but his own, he does not in reality believe even in his own Nation. That is, he does not believe in it as a *Nation*, but merely as an organization to which he himself happens to belong, or which he regards as belonging to him. He has no belief in Nationality as such, and is not in any full sense a patriot, since he does not believe in Patriotism.

As we have seen, a man respects himself because he is a Person and because all Persons are to be respected, so a patriot loves his own Nation because it is his *Nation* and he believes in Nations. That his first duty as a believer in Nations is unquestionably towards the Nation in which Providence has placed him, and for which Providence has made him therefore a trustee, does not mean that he is to have no belief in, respect for, or duty towards other Nations. Thus a parent's first duty is towards his own Family, but this does not mean that he disbelieves in or despises Families in general. The exact reverse, indeed, is the case: the assertion by him of his own Family being

interest. Our British wage-earners have been vilified by Bolshevik leaders in Russia because of their want of "class consciousness,"—because, that is, in this country all classes more or less believe in each other (as they have good reason to do) and refuse to be actuated exclusively by class interest, and deny that the "cash nexus" and the consideration of belly and pocket is the only thing that binds or can bind men together.

It is because the Nation unites men by and through Personality and character, that the definite Socialists so uniformly object to it, and speak of Nations in general as "hideous race monopolies." It is true that here and there we find absolutist Socialists who are faithful to their Nation, but they are so in spite of their Socialism and not because of it.

Different classes of Socialists, for different reasons, desire to see the manual workers of all countries united on materialist grounds for material ends. They never ask themselves how a union of men so inspired and so based could endure. Obviously once the forces against which they united, and for the destruction of which their organization existed, had been destroyed, and they had obtained all the money and advantage which this proceeding could yield them, there would be nothing remaining outside them to keep these people together. Their boasted union and organization would immediately cease to exist. Local or class interests and jealousies would arise, and we should witness again (what History has witnessed through the ages) that mere material gain is never permanently a source of union, but is, on the contrary, always in the end a source of disunion and disruption. In the case we are considering, the same material interest, the same selfishness, that made this superficial union, would also inevitably destroy it.

The Nation then, when healthy and vigorous, binds us together as *men*, as Persons, as beings of *Character*, and

CONCLUSION

It is less as a criterion or touchstone of the value or morality of each and every political measure as it may come up for consideration, that Personal Right is to be regarded, than as an ideal and inspiration which, taught in youth to all our people, should guide and vivify, should hasten or control all citizens at all times, not only when they are acting politically, but also when they are acting as capitalists, shareholders, managers, trade-unionists, Churchmen, Dissenters, householders, or in any other of our human relations.

For the main part Liberty is still believed in in this Country, but of recent years a popular philosophy has arisen, which teaches people, especially perhaps very young people and children, to despise virility and independence as old-fashioned, barbarous and even comic.

There is just now in the air a fatalism which tells us that all (so-called) "new" notions are true and must succeed for no better reason than that they are new. History, however, does not bear this out. If as Individuals we determine to have Freedom, we shall have Freedom. But we must be determined and very watchful, for nothing requires watching so much as Freedom. We have to watch against others tyrannizing over ourselves, but we must watch with even greater care against ourselves (under some excellent pretext or another) tyrannizing over others. If we do not watch we shall find that our Liberty is ceasing to increase and develop, perhaps even that it is actually declining. Thus should we show ourselves unfaithful to our birthright, *i.e.*, the peculiar Social Inheritance of our Land, and disloyal to the noble men and women who have gone before, and who lived and worked, fought, prayed and died that Englishmen might be Free and might set an example to the World.

* * * * *

posal powerful and wealthy organizations, the more logical and enthusiastic are desirous of using the weapon of the organized riot; and a prominent English Socialist informed the people of this Country not long ago, that a main objection to a standing Army was that it would be used not only against external enemies of the Nation and State, but would be employed also for the prevention and suppression of riots. To anyone who values Constitutional Government and the Liberty of the citizen, this argument, supposed to be against a standing Army, is one of the strongest arguments in its favour.

* * * * *

It is true that the modern political Nation is not in its essence tribal or consanguineous; it has, further, no identity as has a Person—that is to say, it is like a river, a river of people. The water which constitutes the river is always changing; form and function alone remain, and yet we speak of it always as the "same" river; so the Nation consists every few years of an entirely new set of Persons. Hence it is that injustices committed by the State at one time can never be fully rectified at another, because many of the victims, perhaps all of them, have flowed by and passed away for ever¹

¹ One cheerful Socialist tells us that we need not disturb ourselves regarding the power of political Majorities, because that Minorities *if they are right* will inevitably become Majorities. Apart from the general dubiousness of the statement, and the extreme difficulty of knowing what a Socialist means by "right," we have to remember that the Minority which becomes a Majority, if it ever does so, is not the *same* Minority as the one which originally and in vain pleaded its cause against the Majority. We must think in terms of *Persons* and not only in terms of States, Majorities, Classes, etc. The Armenians were a Minority, and it is possible that now they will come into their own. But the generations that suffered torment are now for ever beyond the reach of our compassion, be we never so repentant. They called to Christian States to help, but they pleaded "expediency" and the "Good" of their respective States instead of thinking of Right,—the Right of the Person.

by necessary implication the assertion by him of his belief in the Family in general.

It is, however, impossible to believe in our own Nation, and still more impossible to believe in any other Nation, unless we believe that the Individuals composing the Nation are Persons, Ends in themselves, and of infinite individual worth.

For the Nation, apart from the actual Persons who at any moment constitute it, is a mere abstraction ; so that if we do not respect the individual Persons, we shall certainly not respect the Nation which is composed of them

The Peace of the World therefore depends upon our refusing to merge the Individual in the political Community, and upon our explicit, willing recognition of him as an End in himself, and the beginning and the End of the State.

* * * * *

PART II

LEAVING, then, the question of "rights" regarded as expressions of Human, *i e*, Personal, Right, we now come to consider the particular right which we will call the "right to possess;"—using the word "possess" in the sense of "own"

This right is here dealt with separately, not because it can in reality be separated from other rights or from Right in general, nor because it is in itself in the least degree more important, but because at the present it is the consideration foremost in men's minds, and because the issues involved tend increasingly to be referred to strength and to passion, rather than to our national ideals of Right and Liberty.

It must first be pointed out that it is useless to speak of a moral right to possess if possessing or owning seems necessarily to involve injustice, unkindness or injury to sections of the community. If we would uphold the moral right to possess, we must show first that any injustice that may exist is not the necessary result of private ownership as such, but only of unjust modes of it, which modes it is the business of good government to correct.

The notion, however, that ownership necessarily produces injustice and public injury is in these days less due to present economic evils or failures than to the machinations of the now prosperous and extensive tribe of talkers,—the popular politicians, demagogues and the rest,—whose aim is the dissemination of theories and logical systems based on assumptions which ignore the more fundamental facts of Human Nature and of Human Life, and are

True liberty involves a restraint placed upon each Person by himself and by the Law which he willingly makes or subscribes to, in the interest of the Equal Liberty of all Persons in Virtue of their Free Will, that is, of their Personal Being. This Equal Liberty is the only true Equality, an Equality which if it is that of free and widely differing Persons, must express itself in differences of all kinds. Given the security of the Family and the Nation, *i.e.* the bases of our individual Personality and of our social life and coherence, each Person claims for all Persons as an ideal, and as far as it can possibly be achieved, freedom from force or fraud, whether that be at the hands of the State, or of any usurping body, or of any individuals. This Freedom and moral claim to Freedom is what we mean by Personal Right.

The State may use force in the interest of Right or Liberty.

Contrary to certain popular political teachings in this Country, and especially abroad, to claim Liberty for oneself or one's class on grounds of the Common Manhood, is to claim Liberty for all who share in our Manhood, especially for those of our own Nation, and is therefore the recognition and the undertaking of a grave moral responsibility. "Liberty" and "Equality" thus described, rest upon "Fraternity," that is, the willing recognition and assertion by each Man of the Equal Manhood or Personality of his neighbour, especially of his fellow-countryman, be he of whatever class or race he may.

This "Fraternity" is ultimately based upon the Christian view of the Supreme Being and Man's relations to Him.

Liberty, Equality and Fraternity have been and are being appealed to by scheming people in subtle ways for purposes of the disintegration of human society, and for the destruction of the State, the Family and Religion.

Honestly and intelligently understood and applied, they make for Social Individuality, Equality in Difference, and in Multiplicity, Unity.

which have not adopted their theories, and consequently are not in their wretched condition. We ourselves will remember that Ludendorff has told Germany, what most of us knew before, that the German Government introduced Bolshevism into Russia "because Russia had to be laid low." The disease, however, as he laments, crept backwards into his own Country, and, behold, that also was "laid low" (See Appendix A.)

It is a great evil that no systematic effort seems hitherto to have been made by those (of whatever class they may be) who knew better, to check this growth of destructive theories. It must always be remembered that contrary to popular notions regarding academics, the less learned and intellectually disciplined people are, the more liable are they, when they dabble in abstractions at all, to be outwitted by pseudo-intellectuals and dazzled by wonderful theories. The only way to counteract these theories is to set before men something not less but more positive, and also more truly human-divine, more in line with human life in its completeness and fullness. Mere negative criticism is not of much use. He who would help now must be positive and constructive.

But supposing that those who should give us a true vision do not themselves believe in Right (as is constantly and obviously the case), but only, and quite illogically, in their own right to possess? What shall the deceived and the doubting among the people do then—that people which to a degree unknown in other countries is possessed of good sense and quiet wisdom, and is always so willing (especially when addressed individually) to listen to appeals to Justice and Right?

Clearly those who would give us a right vision of things must not only themselves believe in Right, but they must boldly and openly assert it as the basis of their whole teaching and claim. In vain will they try to turn the tables on their opponents by deciding that they themselves

In the dialogue that follows, the opponents of "Wiseman" are in many cases purposely represented as extremists. The reason for this is that it is easier to discuss and judge a principle when that is (a) fully developed, and (b) not obscured by illogical and contradictory modifications

Experience causes me to beg the reader to remember that the word "Socialist" is in this book used of one kind of people only, and solely as defined in Part I. It applies, that is, only to people who hold certain specific views regarding the relation of Man to God and to the State, and to others only in the measure in which they also are affected by these views. The Christian Socialists (the Christian Socialists figure in the little dialogue that follows) are in actual present fact, and for the main part, necessarily only Socialists (as Socialists are here defined) in a very hazy and partial sense, and to a very small degree. They are Reformers who would be better styled Social Christians than Christian Socialists.

REPRESENTATIVE SAYINGS

"I hate the very word Freedom"—AN ENGLISH SOCIALIST

"Freedom is a Bourgeois superstition"—A RUSSIAN BOLSHEVIST

it for their own convenience. But it must be remembered that as no one can deny this right without denying Right in general, so no one can assert it without asserting Right in general, *i.e.*, the Right not only of himself, *but of each and every individual Man*, and determining in matters of getting and keeping (as in all other matters) to respect and insist upon that universal Right, and to do this even upon occasion when they might profitably and safely do otherwise. Thus at least, whether we be employers or employed, we shall not always find to be a "pleasing and useful doctrine" Right is not a generic name for a farrago of rights, it is a principle or a relation between men which must be accepted in all its applications or in none. This is true of all principles.

When we criticize the possession of wealth or riches we are much tempted to think only of *great* wealth, *great* riches, and by great wealth we mean wealth considerably in excess of our *own* modest income, this income being generally regarded by us as reasonable, and at any rate as not erring on the side of excess.

But every inhabitant of this country, with the exception of an infinitesimal minority, is an owner or possessor; so that while we are virtuously rebuking wealth we must remember that we ourselves are possessors, and are in our turn the object of the envy (as in this case we call it) of others. Thus (to take pre-War days) a miner with £7 a week is a rich man in the eyes of a farm hand getting 15s. a week. The right to possess does not involve the right to prevent others from possessing more than is possessed by ourselves, for the reason that so far as we prevent others from possessing more than we do, *so far* we are denying their right to possess, and denying, therefore, the whole conception of human Right or Liberty.

Again: the right to possess must be clearly distinguished in our minds from any real or supposed right to possess a certain *amount* of things, or a certain *kind*

notoriously not only of foreign origin, but are supported financially, journalistically and otherwise by foreigners, or persons of alien race. Consider, as a single instance, the following secret message sent by Karl Marx to the "Internationale" at Geneva. (1) England is the only Country in which a real socialistic revolution can be made. (2) The English people cannot make this revolution. (3) Foreigners must make it for them. (4) The foreign members, therefore, must retain their seats at the London board. Again: "Every revolution on the Continent that does not spread to England," says Marx, "is a storm in a teacup." ["Cause of World Unrest"—Appendix] Continues the author of this Appendix: "In other words, England is the pivot of the world's civilization. If England goes, the whole world goes with her. Marx was right . . . in believing that British working men will never make this revolution. 'Foreigners must make it for them.' They are making it now. Shall we allow them to accomplish their work?" Speaking of the revolutionary machine, says the author: "I do not think that it can be ascribed to one race only; many hands have worked at it, French, Italian, Russian, very few English, but many German and Jewish."

Incidentally it may be observed that before rushing into their arms, we should ask what these kind foreigners are going to *lose*, what they are going to sacrifice of ambition, concupiscence, malice and of desire to "impose their will" in their sudden affection for the English and devotion to our welfare, or if perchance, on the other hand, they are going to *gain* something—and at our expense? Pending a credible answer, the British will tell them to go and mind their own business in their own Countries, especially those Countries where their theories have "succeeded." That business we now perceive will need a lot of minding, so much so, that we know that they despair of their cause while there exist other Countries

or their utilitarian conception of what is at any time "useful" for themselves, for us, or for the State, it is evident that for political or utilitarian reasons our Free Will and judgment will constantly be invaded, and anything like a moral life, *i.e.* a life controlled by our own Conscience and moral principle, would be impossible. Secondly: such a state of things overthrows the whole belief in Personal Right, and consequently all our belief in the divine Relation and divine Right of our neighbour, and, therefore, also (as we can see on every hand at the present moment) all belief or possibility of belief in the moral authority or divine Right of the State.

A man's body is not merely the means through which his Personality realizes and expresses itself, it is itself also an expression of that Personality, and is claimed as such by the Person. Because, therefore, a man's body is the expression of his Personality and also the means to further expression and realization, he claims to own his body, and to own also anything else which is through his body an expression of his Personality, *i.e.* of his love, and of his thought, will and desire. It is in this way that he claims the right to possess or own his children. It is true that in view of the fact that these children will one day be self-determined adult citizens claiming the use of their Free Will, the State imposes certain duties upon the parents regarding them. But this is not because the State conflicts with or denies in any way the parent's right to possess, but because by this means the vital relations of the home will tend more certainly to the turning out of good and independent citizens.

A man, then, desires and claims to own his body as the expression and instrument of his Personality, and by the same moral necessity he claims to own anything else (so far as he himself is the producer of that thing) that through his body is also an expression of that same Personality and of that same Free Will. Thus, for instance, the food for

also (despairing of the effectiveness of any higher appeal) will preach to the wage-earners a selfish non-moral materialism, only that they will preach it much more learnedly that they will rely upon an unemotional but sound political economy and the facts of economic history: that they will demonstrate to the wage-earners how in the long run the wage-earners and certainly their children after them will be richer if they listen to true reason.

This sort of teaching taken alone is useless. Those who would oppose sweet-sounding communistic theories, with their promise to the people of immediate material bliss, cannot do so merely by proposing to the people a longer-sighted selfishness. They must, on the contrary, trust the people and believe (as the War especially has shown us we have every reason to believe) that the English love of Right and Justice is as alive as ever—in spite of those who at this moment are proclaiming so gleefully and so extremely noisily, its death.

The main importance of the right to possess lies in the fact that it is an application or expression of moral Right in general, *i.e.* of that absolute moral Right without which Personality, Free Will and Moral Responsibility (*i.e.* specifically Human life and deliberate, willing citizenship and unity) are incapable of realization. So that our appeal must be made in the first instance, not to political economy or long-sighted self-interest, but to Right and Justice. That is to say, the right to possess cannot be asserted merely by people who possess and because they want to continue possessing, nor by others because they want to possess, nor by those who, believing in Right, have not sufficient faith in the people to appeal to it; it can only be asserted by those who believe in Right, and solely because they believe in it, and who are not afraid to confess their belief.

Some might say that this doctrine of a right to possess is a pleasing and useful doctrine, and that they will adopt

from errors and abuses which are admittedly apt to be attendant upon it, as they are apt to be attendant upon everything human

Let us see, then, how it is at any rate possible to get property and to inherit it, to make use of that property productively, and to exchange it for the property or labour of others, with advantage to the Community and without injuring anyone.

* * * * *

In order to follow easily the operation of the principle of the Right to possess, it will be better to follow it in the case of a community which is simple and primitive,—not because the principle does not apply in a similar manner and with equal force in a community which is complex, but on the principle that it is easier to trace the essential structure of a thin and, one might add, nude person, than that of one who is clothed in accumulations of tissue, and gorgeous, but irrelevant, garments

In such a comparatively simple community, then, there dwelt one whose name (or rather we should say sobriquet) was the equivalent of "Wise Man," and of whom we shall speak, as a matter of convenience, by the good English surname of Wiseman

Now this Wiseman, who was far more intelligent, enterprising and self-controlled than most of his fellow-countrymen, made a journey to certain distant countries, much more advanced than his own, in order that he might learn from them. In due course he returned, having after much hard work learned a variety of things. One of these things was the art of building small but reliable sea-going vessels

But Wiseman before departing on his travels had looked upon the daughters of his native land, and found them exceeding fair—especially one of them. This one he was determined to marry. But first of all he must have the wherewithal, as he desired her and her children to live in

of thing, or certain particular objects. If we are clear in our minds as to the right to possess at all, and the moral ground upon which that right is based, the questions as to *what* and *how* we are to make, to keep, and to get, will be very much more easy of solution. Thus, given the clear understanding and admission of, first, the abstract right to possess, and, secondly, of the moral ground on which that is based, namely, the Right or Liberty of each individual Person, then we may be able to decide on moral and rational grounds that a certain person has, *e g*, a right to possess a certain cargo of fish, while a certain other man has no right to possess a certain cargo of slaves.

Given, then, a full recognition of the Personality or Spirituality of Man with the free will and consequent moral responsibility and claim to *self*-ownership, *self*-control, *self*-discipline and *self*-development involved in it, it is clear that he will claim Liberty from coercion for his own Free Will and for that of every other man, and that the first particular or specific Liberty or Right he will claim is the right to possess his own body.

His body is his means of communication and intercourse with his fellow-men, and consequently also of his realization of his Personality. But it will only be this if it is at his own disposal—that is to say, if his right to possess it is understood and asserted by himself and his neighbour.

We cannot exercise our Free Will or Conscience in any social sense if the body, through which we thus exercise it, is entirely controlled by another. It is true that slaves have often been very good men and very saintly Christians, but they were so only because that, in spite of their slavery, they had in many regards, and at many times, the control of their bodies. Such relative or contingent control or Liberty, however, is insufficient for two reasons. First: if we hold our Liberty, not as a matter of absolute Right in virtue of our Personality, but as an immunity or ability conferred upon us by others according to their pleasure

the capital he required (and which is always required if we are going to do anything in advance of mere barbarians), decided to save and store, or sell, the barley he would otherwise have made into beer—beer which would otherwise have been pleasantly but unproductively consumed by himself and his friends. He also decided to put in more time fishing, so that he might have more fish than he himself required, and so have spare fish for salting and keeping or selling.

Time passed, and at last Wiseman found that he had enough barley, fish, clothing and money, *i.e.* enough *capital*, to start employing the men who were to help him build his first vessel.

This little vessel when completed, as it very soon was, naturally was of the greatest use to him as a fisherman, and in consequence he was now constantly in possession of more fish by far than he himself could use. This surplus he sold to his neighbours; and *although each purchaser gave only a very small sum, yet the purchasers being numerous and their demands continuous*, Wiseman for the time being, *i.e.* until others took to using sea-going vessels too, had a very prosperous time, and made and *saved* a considerable sum of money. The public, too, benefited, all having now more and cheaper fish than they had had previously.

But a second advantage arose. It was in due course perceived that the amount of fish required by the Community could now be procured in fewer hours' labour than formerly, so that much of the labour hitherto spent in supplying the necessary fish could now be devoted to other kinds of work,—largely in this case to farming and gardening.

Wiseman built several vessels, but after a time he perceived it would be expedient and profitable to sell one or two of these, together with the secrets involved in building them, to a number of fishermen who were desirous of becoming boat-builders. After this transaction, and the construction and sale of a few more boats to the fishing

his children, the corn he has grown for them or the fish he has caught, he will claim as his own, and will assert that, in the absence of any proven force or fraud, his own children have a greater right to these expressions of his own soul and body than have the children of anyone else.¹

Now, while the wealth of this or that individual may have its origin in injury to others, so that just in proportion as the individual in question is enriched some one else is made poor, yet *this is not generally the case*, and where it is the case the State should use its force to prevent such violations of Right. We must not allow ourselves to be persuaded to make use of what is wrong in our social and economic methods as a pretext for attacking what is right. If we attack the whole moral principle of the right to possess on the ground that we have found something wrong in the operation or application of that right, it is highly probable that we are deceiving ourselves as to our motives, and that we are actuated rather by a secret envy of certain of our fellow-citizens, or by a hostility to Right in general, than by the desire to promote Justice.

It is then on grounds of moral Right that private ownership must be defended. But, as has been stated above, in order to get a sympathetic hearing for this moral claim, in order, in other words, that the claim shall really be seen to be moral, it is necessary to clear away certain misconceptions regarding the alleged inevitable relation between private ownership and the evils of injustice, unkindness and hardship which are supposed to be part and parcel of it, by examining it as it is in itself, and apart

¹The greatest incentive to making and keeping wealth is admittedly the Family—parents striving for their children, children for their parents, or for each other, or for their own children. It is partly this fact that causes Socialists, Communists, Bolsheviks and the rest to speak of the Family as "a hotbed of individualism," and to desire to undermine it and ultimately to overthrow it.

they were before the arrangement was made, or than they could have been without the arrangement, they have no cause to grudge or to complain of the greater wealth which (there being in his case *no division* to be made) falls to the individual of the party consisting of a single person. Thus at a considerably later period in the development of this community, a descendant of Wiseman, by means of capital, inventions and business knowledge and practice, established on a single system a number of good eating-houses, and considerably cheaper than any existing at the time. It was estimated that every day 1000 persons were thus saved 3d each. But the net saving effected by this new catering system being 4d each dinner, the owner of the business, who had reduced to the clients the price of each dinner only by 3d, put to his own account 1d. of the saving per dinner. Let us suppose that the 1000 diners were always approximately the same persons. We see here an arrangement between two parties, one party being an individual and the other 1000 individuals. There is now, we perceive, a question of the distribution of a net daily saving of 1000 fourpences—approximately £16. Now although the owner only takes one-quarter of this, and the other party to the arrangement takes three-quarters, yet the amount of the saving daily received by the individual of the first party (the owner) is, roughly, £4, and that received by each individual of the second party (the diners) is 3d. But the 1000 persons of the second party receive 1000 threepences, or 3d. each (or are saved it, which in this case is the same thing), which they would certainly not have done had it not been to the interest of the owner to save his money instead of spending it, and then to risk it in a speculative undertaking.

But to return to Wiseman. He had now amassed what, at that time and place, was quite a fortune. He had become a Capitalist and a public benefactor, though at the cost of thinking, working and, last but not least,

as refined and comfortable a way as he himself could contrive, and in a manner suited to her own pleasant home. Now the Community to which Wiseman belonged being poor and primitive, they had comparatively few inventions. The staple food of the people was fish and barley. Among other inconveniences the Community had no serviceable boats or vessels of any kind. So Wiseman decided that in order to get enough to keep a wife and family he would do two things—namely, he would save, and he would produce, *i.e.* he would do both to a greater extent than hitherto. To this end he determined to put to good use his knowledge of the secrets of shipbuilding.

Now Wiseman knew from the start that he could not build a ship alone, but must engage two men to help him. He also knew that these two men must be maintained till their work was done. Wherefore he decided to save up part of the barley he grew, and salt, and put by part of the fish that he caught; also to go hunting when possible, and get skins, etc., for exchange. Not only would he get and save these things, but he would refrain from the temptation to expend it all on indulgence and amusement. He calculated not only to be able to feed his men, but by exchanging his products or wares for clothing and money, to be able to supply them with clothing and wages.

In other words, he had perceived that if he was to produce above the level of the merest savage, he must have something stored up to start with, *i.e.* he must have *capital*.

He found that, under the circumstances of that time and place, there were two principal ways in which he could save. First, as to barley. In Wiseman's country it was customary for people to grow more barley than they actually needed for food, because everybody was in the habit of making a considerable part of their barley into a pleasant and wholesome, but unnecessary beverage somewhat like our beer. Wiseman therefore, in order to create

Against this it was argued (and the argument was accepted as just by the people in general) that it was illogical, if not immoral, to compel a man, merely because he had put to good use the property of the State, to pay more towards the maintenance of the Community than if he had put the same property to a bad, or unsuccessful, use. It was pointed out that if you give two men a similar meal each, one will go forth and do good work and earn good money, while the other will go to sleep; and that it would be illogical, impolitic and immoral to charge the man who had done the work and made the money, more for his meal than they charged the man who had wasted his food in sleep and dreams.

Against this reasonable position it was contended by the social enthusiasts (who loved the Community better than they loved either Right or the Persons who composed the Community) that all fortunes were wrong because many fortunes were not made honestly, as Wiseman had made his, but were made wholly or in part by injustice and robbery, and that taxation was a method of enabling the Community to get their own back again.

Nobody, however, would listen to this—on the ground that it was the duty of the State not to make its money by taxing immorally made fortunes, but to prevent people from making fortunes in a manner which was immoral. It was shown that Wiseman, at any rate, had not made his money improperly, but that, on the contrary, the whole Community had shared in his prosperity, and that it would be wrong and extremely impolitic to punish the just with the unjust.

“But surely you do not wish that the richer people should not pay more towards the State than the poorer,” objected Wiseman’s critics. Now, in the time of Wiseman’s grandfather there had been a war, and money had had to be raised for this, as also against possible future foreign aggression. It seemed at the time that a system of direct

community, fishing was vastly more successful and productive than formerly. It now, therefore, became an easy matter for an industrious man to obtain a *surplus* of fish, and salt it and keep it for future use. It was mainly this surplus fish which enabled those who had saved it to embark more largely upon agriculture, etc., or to pay others to do it for them, while they themselves continued fishing. This surplus of fish, which they had worked for and saved, became, in fact, what we should call their *capital*.

So we see that as a result of Wiseman's enterprise, the Community now obtained, in addition to their necessary fish, an amount of varied farm produce, etc., and that for the same number of hours of labour as was formerly necessary to provide them with fish and barley alone.

We have seen that Wiseman sold his surplus fish to his neighbours, and made a very good thing by it. But contrary to a dogma (dressed up to be attractive and just now very popular) that what one man gains another man loses, the public were, as we have seen, also greatly benefited. In the case before us each purchaser gave Wiseman only a very small sum, but the purchasers being numerous and their demands continuous, Wiseman himself made a very large sum. The benefit therefore accruing to each individual of the purchasing public was, of course, not as great as was that of Wiseman. But this was not in any way an injustice: and this is a very important point to note. For where there are two parties to an arrangement, if one of these parties is a *single* individual (as in this case Wiseman), and the other party is a *great number* of individuals (as in this case the purchasing public), and if the two parties go, say, equal shares in any matter, while viewed *as parties* the two parties are equally enriched, yet viewed *as individuals* they will clearly not be equally enriched. But seeing that all the persons of the party containing many individuals are severally better off than

tection of the State, and that there was no really logical or moral reason why a person who makes more pounds than another should be compelled to pay more *per pound* because he had done so. He might, of course, *give* his money away, as Wiseman so largely did—but that is a different matter.

Secondly, it was justly pointed out to the critics by the supporters of Wiseman, that Wiseman paid more to the Community through his consumption of *taxed commodities*, especially luxuries, and that it would be a good thing if the Country proceeded at once to increase the number of such taxes and relied more upon them, for that then those persons with large families, who do not generally have many luxuries, would in this way pay automatically less towards the Community; while those trying to save and invest out of their incomes would be less hindered in their endeavour.

In the last resort the champions of Socialism stated quite simply that whether this confiscation by taxation was moral or immoral, whether it was logical or illogical, or whether it was economically speaking politic or impolitic, at any rate it was convenient and popular, and furthermore that whether from the pulpit, the rostrum or the soap-box there was nowadays nothing so popular and so easy as to play upon the economic ignorance of the many in order to arouse envy and indignation against the few. They stated that this was especially useful at elections, and was in consequence the course they intended to pursue.

Taxation, said the "orators" (though the people of Wiseman's Country did not listen to them very much), should no longer be regarded as a means for maintaining the necessary machinery of the State, but should be prostituted for the purpose of (a) ultimately eliminating the envied persons who made or saved money, (b) of getting possession of the enterprises they had variously initiated

saving instead of spending, and then proceeding to risk his savings in a speculative enterprise. Certain persons, however, who affected a great enthusiasm for "The State" and "The People" were very angry at this, and said, first, that Wiseman had used wood, pitch, etc., in the building of his vessels, that these things (though the idea had never occurred to them before) belonged to the State or Community; and, secondly, that had it not been for the protection and facilities afforded him by the State, he would never have been able to make or use the boat at all. In view of this latter contention it was argued that as without the State he could have had no boat at all, therefore the boat and the wealth he had made by it belonged, not to him, but to the Community.

The general public, however, would not listen to the argument of these self-styled social enthusiasts, but pointed out, through their spokesman, that the protection afforded by the State was common to all, and was by no means a special boon conferred upon Wiseman; that the difference in wealth between Wiseman and his neighbours did not at all lie in the protection afforded him by the State, for that was common to all alike, but in the *superior use* he had made of the State and its protection to express and realize his Personality and his capacities in a particular manner; and that, in brief, the differentiating factor between Wiseman and his neighbours did not consist in the State protection extended to Wiseman, but in Wiseman's superior power of *producing* and *saving*.

The other argument of the social enthusiasts, namely, that regarding the *materials* (i.e. the wood, etc.) that Wiseman had used, and which they said belonged to the State, was similar to the above. They tried to show that not only should Wiseman pay the State for these raw materials (a thing which he was quite willing to do), but that he must pay for them in proportion to the benefit he had derived from his use of them.

munity, by means of this bridge, saved itself several hundred hours a day. A large part of Wiseman's past and accumulated *profits* on his boats were now converted into a bridge, so that until further profits came in, his boats and his bridge constituted his capital. The large interest, however, he was getting on his investment exposed him not only to envy, but to a great deal of hostile—though sincere—criticism.

So satisfied was Wiseman at the success of this enterprise, that after much calculation he decided that it would pay him to build a much longer bridge indeed, but considerably lower down, nearer the estuary, where it would be of very much greater service to his fellow-townsmen. This he in time proceeded to do out of the profits on his boats and his bridge. But unfortunately for him his second bridge had only been in use a few months when a clever man (and willing to take a big financial risk for the sake of the profit he saw he might get if his calculations were correct) conceived the idea of a large flat-bottomed Ferry, which should be propelled along taut ropes (arranged diagonally to the stream) by means of the current¹. Of these he constructed several, together with suitable landing-places. These ferries operated where the river widened to the estuary, and directly between the town and the shore opposite, and so were more convenient even than the second or new bridge higher up the river.

The people now had no walking to do at all, and were saved still more precious time. The effect, however, upon Wiseman was that the profits on his two bridges were reduced at times to nothing, and at the best of times to a negligible amount, though (and this was a benefit to the Community) their existence as competitors compelled the ferry-owner to charge very much smaller fares and rates and to maintain a more frequent service than he would otherwise have done.

¹ Such ferries are not a nightmare, they exist, e.g., in Switzerland

taxation was the only efficient means for doing this. An ungraduated Income Tax, as we should call it, had, therefore, been introduced, not indeed as an ideal tax, but as the best thing that it was supposed could be done under the circumstances. This tax was not invented in order to *injure* those who had made and saved money or who had inherited it, but rather was it for their *protection* against the enemies of their Country. That people had no right to money, and that this tax, especially if graduated, was a means for depriving them of it, was the invention of a later day, when justice, independence and liberty were much less respected. The result was that in Wiseman's time the mass of the people were willing and anxious that the tax in question should be kept as low, instead of as high as possible. It was, however, admitted that while an ungraduated Income Tax was the ideal, yet for various reasons it was not always practicable.

Two things were now pointed out to Wiseman's critics when they claimed that the richer should in future pay more than the poorer towards the maintenance of the Community. First, it was shown that under the ungraduated Income Tax the richer already did pay more, and that in strict proportion to their greater wealth. Thus a man with £1000 income paid ten times to the Community more than was paid by the man with £100, while those with less than £100, as a matter of public utility and also of kindness, were not, in that community, asked to pay anything at all. Because Wiseman did not pay more *per pound* than poorer men, people began to overlook the obvious fact that the total financial support that he contributed to the maintenance of the Community was of very much greater value than that which his critics were in the habit of providing. The general public agreed with Wiseman, and considered that it was just and wise, and the ideal to be aimed at, that in the case of a Direct Tax that each person should pay to the State so much for each pound made under the pro-

an expenditure of £100. The first business paid him 12 per cent, but unhappily the average of businesses that fail was about the same in Wiseman's Country as in others, and his other two enterprises completely failed. This capitalist's profit, therefore, on the *whole* of his capital was only 4 per cent. Many were the people who, without having considered the risks investors run and the losses they sustain, said that it was unnecessary, if not unjust, that this capitalist should get (in his successful enterprise) as much as 12 per cent, and they claimed that the State should tax him at a higher rate, and that his labourers should share in his prosperity, regardless of the fact that the capitalist's profit on the whole £300 invested was, in view of losses, in reality only 4 per cent—an income not sufficient to induce capitalists to continue saving and risking their savings in productive enterprises of a speculative nature. They did not perceive that if the man were taxed extra on his successful undertaking, and had also in that undertaking to pay higher wages on account of and in proportion to its success, that the interest on this man's invested savings viewed *as a whole* would only be, say, 1½ per cent, though these people, had they known and considered these facts, were not so stupid as not to be able to realize that 1½ per cent is not enough profit to overcome the inclination of most people for present indulgence, and to induce them to save and invest.

As we have seen, Wiseman's misfortune in the matter of his bridges set his more thoughtful neighbours considering many issues, generally ignored by Socialists, one of which was, we see, that, if we would ascertain justly what is the average interest on invested savings, the unseen *losses* of capital must be set against the visible *gains*.

A second matter was as follows. It was contended by Socialistic persons that if, instead of the individual, the State had owned all capital and had had the monopoly of production, this loss of capital would not have taken

and paid for; and (c) of meanwhile providing, under various pretexts, gifts for the wage-earners, and especially for the richer and more powerful sections of them.

It was reported that a small minority of Wiseman's critics even went so far as to deny that the Income Tax should be employed against the Enemy of their Community at all. "Is not," they argued, "the National Enemy also the enemy of Wiseman and of all similar people in our Community; is it not also the enemy of our Government which we in our turn hate, because, equally with all others in the Community, this our Government protects Wiseman and all other of our fellow-citizens who have committed the offence of saving and investing?" So on the principle that those who hate the same thing love one another, these precious people found themselves in the end very kindly disposed towards the Enemy.

Wiseman, however, in the upshot was left in peace, and was permitted as much liberty as was enjoyed by the rest of the Community.

He had discovered that while labour is the source of all wealth, capital is the source of all labour. Having in view of this become a capitalist, he now proceeded to become a considerable and regular Employer—that is, he encouraged certain men, by offering them more than they were at that time earning, to build more boats; and, secondly, to construct, according to his own specifications, a footbridge some way up the river, at the top of the estuary of which his little town was situated. At this point the river had sufficiently narrowed to render his experiment feasible. Hitherto people had had to go a long way round, and considerably above where the bridge now was, to a ford in order to get to their work on the other side, opposite the town. A very small charge was made for the use of the bridge, but so many were the people who were saved time and money by using it, that Wiseman added considerably to his fortune. It was perceived that the Com-

they did not pretend that this elimination would do anything more than increase the commercial inefficiency of the State

The public, however, in Wiseman's time were not much dismayed by these socialistic arguments as we should term them. The argument, namely, that competition was economically and socially mischievous, they agreed to, so far as to say that (as experience in their own Community had shown) evils would certainly attend it if the people were not watchful and sincerely anxious to prevent evils, as under such conditions of indifference or neglect, evils will arise in any system, be that what it may. They perceived that a certain social morality is as necessary for the maintenance of a competition which should be wholesome and vigorous, as for the maintenance of anything else in health and vigour. We ourselves in England know from the history of the eighteenth and most of the nineteenth centuries, how the wage-earner may be subjected to bad conditions, and fail of his proper (*i.e.* economically justifiable) share in the material benefits accruing to the Community, not only through the much-talked-of "greed" of employers, but also through the competition of wage-earners among themselves, and through the necessity under which—in the absence of a regulated industrial organization—employers found themselves of perpetually cutting down cost of production under the stress of competition. The answer to this lies not in the abolition of competition, but in social combinations for mutual support, such as guilds, unions, conferences of employers and employed, etc., and in well-conceived legislation, which, by removing the accidental evils of competition, would leave the essential good. In a free community the demands of unions, etc., regarding wages and conditions would be prevented from becoming permanently excessive by the fact that, if they went beyond a certain point, profits on capital would be so reduced that

This loss by Wiseman of most of the capital he had put into his bridges caused the more intelligent and thoughtful of the Community to reflect upon certain aspects of capital and production. A few only of these will here be considered.

It was perceived, in the first place, that in estimating the profits of capital, it is misleading merely to consider the enterprises which, at any moment, one sees to be flourishing around one—that is to say, that this striking event caused them to observe that it is possible to invest money and *lose* it all, and that the reason so many people overlook this fact is that lost money doesn't show. Either the plant of the enterprise which has failed is quickly swept away, or the plant remains, having been sold at a loss to other persons who, having invested very little in it, are able to make it pay a good interest. Our own England could provide abundant instances of this. Thus a person might build a fine Hotel for £50,000 and then find that in the running of it he lost heavily. He then sells it to somebody else for £5000, and the public only perceives a successful enterprise, and have the benefit of a fine Hotel. They neither know nor care about the £45,000 that was lost. People who want to sell a business, which is to them unprofitable, do not cry their losses in the street, and that is one reason, though only one, why lost money doesn't show. We repeat, therefore, that in estimating the profits of capital, we must take into consideration *all* capital, *all* enterprises, both successful and *unsuccessful*, remembering always that the vast majority of enterprises *fail*. If we were to do this faithfully it would be found that the profits on capital, which are the inducement to save and to risk one's savings, were as small as is compatible with the maintaining of the inducement. Thus in Wiseman's Community a person had saved £300—a sum which, at that time and place, was not inconsiderable. He embarked upon three enterprises each involving

(which are not run on economic lines, and the officers of which differ psychologically from civilian officials), most methods or inventions which Governments or Municipal Bodies employ are those which have been evolved under and borrowed from the system of private interest and of competition, and have there already been proved successful, and that their standards of excellence are for the main part based on the achievements of current private enterprise, to which public opinion compels them to conform¹

The Community then decided that it would be foolish and wrong to suppress Wiseman, the ferry-owner, and other persons of that kind, for the purpose of handing over all commercial enterprise to the State—an institution not created nor fashioned for production, and in all ways unsuited for it. Four main reasons for this opinion (though there were many others) were advanced. First: the Government officials who would replace competitive and personally interested men of commerce would not be *trained* under competitive conditions, and would not and could not be *chosen for efficiency* proven by "survival" in the field of competition, but would be chosen on various extraneous grounds. Secondly: in the absence of the *moral inspiration* of the armed patriots, who stand for the honour and the sanctity of the Home and the Motherland; and on the other hand being actuated by no hopes or fears for themselves or their families (this all being incompatible with Communism), neither they nor their subordinates would have any natural stimulus to energy or courage. Thirdly: immediate political or electioneering considerations would conflict with, and in the course of time would triumph over, economic issues. And fourthly: the elimination of competition (which is the first necessity of all State enterprise) would aggravate these evils.

¹ The most extreme instance of economic incompetence is to be found in the Soviet Government of Russia at the present moment.

place, because under no socialistic or communistic system was *competition* permitted, it being held that competition was wicked and (what was worse) wasteful. That being so, the new ferry vessels which had done all the *harm* as it was called by the Socialists (though the thoughtful of the people in general said that the balance of things was in favour of the public) would not have existed, or, at any rate, not until the distant day when the bridges had decayed.

Now the State, when it embarks upon trade in any form, always *prevents competition*, and this not by the superiority of its methods and its power to excel, but quite simply by means of Coercive Law, *i e.*, by means of the physical force which the people originally placed at its disposal for quite other purposes. In Wiseman's Country the proposed forcible elimination of competition was defended on several extremely different grounds. Some said (with different degrees of sincerity) that it was contrary to Christian teaching—a matter we shall consider later on in another connection. Others declared that it was *economically and socially mischievous*; while others asserted that it was an excellent idea that in production and distribution (as in all other matters) the State should submerge the individual, especially such individuals as tended to excel or become pre-eminent; but that this submergence was particularly important in the case of State-trading, because experience showed that the State, owing to a variety of very obvious causes, did not, and indeed could not, in point of efficiency and enterprise, successfully compete with private persons. For such persons being unhampered by considerations of politics and popularity, and being stimulated by interest and selected by competition, ran their businesses efficiently and with the single object of making them economically successful. Competition, said the Socialists, must, therefore, in the interest of State trading, be eliminated, although

We now come to another consideration which arose among the more intelligent of Wiseman's contemporaries after his loss of capital in the matter of the bridges. We have seen how some said that there should be no private enterprises, but that all capital should belong to the State. It occurred, however, to certain of the community, and the general public fully agreed with them, that if capital were not to be provided *voluntarily* by those with the desire and the ability to do it, it must be provided compulsorily—that is to say, the State would have to be empowered to *conscript* either wages or labour to the extent of its requirements. They saw that the capital that the State would require, if material progress was to continue, would have to be (as we have already seen) not *less* than that which was annually raised and employed (successfully or otherwise) under their existing system of private ownership. They perceived, moreover, that the capital required by the State would in actual practice have to be *greater* than that which was necessary under their existing system, owing to the business inefficiency of the State, and its manifold temptations to unproductive expenditure. But what the people most resented was the blow that this new form of slavery would aim at human dignity, and the wreckage it would make of human Liberty. People would no longer be permitted to make agreements designed for their mutual benefit, nor would they be allowed to utilize according to their own judgment the material expressions (whether money or goods) of their labour and their life, while a great part of their wages or their labour would be forcibly taken from them whether, as individuals, they desired it or not. It would be taken from them for the purpose—not, as heretofore, merely of *maintaining the necessary machinery* of the State—but for the building up of capital which would not be their own, and over the disposition of which, as individuals, they would exercise no control, and from which they would derive costly

people would begin to cease to save and to invest, or would only invest abroad.

It was argued, as we have seen, by Socialistic people, that if the people had been wise enough to become Socialists, that then the State would have had everything in its own hands, and that, having constructed a bridge, the State would not, on grounds of economy, have allowed any new invention (such as the ferries) to come in and render the bridge out of date, and that in this way, by preventing the doubling and the "scrapping" of things, much waste would be averted and the Community would be greatly benefited. While this argument appealed very properly to the indifference, grooviness and timidity of government and trade-union officials, the public, which as a whole had benefited greatly by the introduction of the ferries, were unable to appreciate it. A certain member of this public very properly pointed out that the refusal to adopt new and improved methods (good in themselves and, once adopted, generally capable of endless improvement) tended always to the *injury* of the Community. He showed, further, how, if the State were to benefit the Community as much as had Wiseman and others like him, and if progress were to continue as hitherto, the State must make *experiments* just as did these private persons, and must have the courage and the power, in spite of the ignorant anger of this or that section of electors, to take the rough with the smooth, and be prepared to face the unpleasantness and unpopularity of great risks and frequent and heavy losses—*this being the price of all progress*. The principle that emerged was that, if the State is to be as economically useful as the individual, its officials must not only have the energy and efficiency of the private individuals, but it *must face the same risks as do they*. This, however, we know as well as did Wiseman, that the Statesmen and politicians of no country are willing to do. We know that, leaving the Navy and Army on one side

Religion for their own purposes, believing neither in its Founder nor in the Authority of His morality, who openly or secretly disbelieved and detested all religion, and were in their hearts wholly and utterly insincere. They pretended to accept the morality of the Religion, but if they were Communistic, they would be found secretly, and (when they dared) openly, trying to undermine, *e.g.*, the Christian law of marriage. They further stated that the first and only important matter in the Christian Religion was that we should love our neighbour, although the Founder had taught with the utmost emphasis that "the first and great commandment" was something quite different, and that any hope of men loving each other, or any reason why they should do so, was based upon and derived from this "first and great commandment". They pretended also, on Christian grounds, to be very much opposed to War. But unexpected events showed that they were only opposed to war against the enemies of their own Government, and that they were quite willing (as actually happened in certain of the neighbouring States) to slaughter their fellow-citizens for an indefinite period, at the rate of many hundreds a week; and this, not because these citizens had done anything wrong, but merely because they did not want these communists, socialistic absolutists (or whatever they chose to call themselves) to reign over them. Under examination, it turned out that the only thing that they believed in in the Christian Religion or morality was an idea not really to be found in that Religion or morality, namely, that all goods must be compulsorily divided up among the citizens. With such evil zeal did they believe this that they taught—in violent opposition to the basal morality of the Christian Religion—that the Family, which constitutes the principal motive for private property, should be abolished and replaced by sexual promiscuity, and that there should be communism in women and children, who indeed were to be placed at

Against the above reasoning the following criticism was advanced, namely, that in the case of many enterprises which were privately owned, competition had either never existed, or had been eliminated ; and Wiseman's first bridge, with its long spell of commercial success, was instanced

In answer to this it was pointed out that, first, in the case of most industries competition *did* exist ; and, secondly, that there was nothing to make one suppose that the public would necessarily be more greatly inconvenienced by a private monopoly than by a State one. Wiseman, at any rate, had an interest in seeing that his enterprise was efficiently conducted, that the plant used was not excessive and was the best for the money ; that (to encourage the public) the fares were low, *i.e.*, low enough to give him his greatest profit, and that his employees were efficient, assiduous, civil and honest. It was not apparent, in Wiseman's country, that the State would be likely to do better than this or even do half as well ; such, at least, was the painful experience of that simple people.

The general conclusion in regard to the whole subject of competition was that while it was true that apart from good will, the love of justice, watchfulness and precaution, evils would attend competition and private ownership in general ; and while it was also true that under the Community's free system it was not everybody who was made rich, yet, in view of the imperfections of all human systems and of men themselves, only very flighty persons, or persons blinded by envy or concupiscence, could suppose, in the face of reason and experience, that no evils would attach to State monopoly, or that under that régime, any more than under any other, all persons would live in a state of affluence. It was perceived, on the contrary, that such affluence as the people already enjoyed was largely the result of the prizes, great and small, which their system offered to those possessed of powers which should prove of economic benefit to the Community.

was everything and the actual money nothing, thus reversing the attitude of so many modern reformers

• "Secondly The early Christians did not extend their communism to infidels, non-Christians or anti-Christians. It was an expression of the 'communion of Saints,' and was based upon the idea of the Church being an indivisible Living Body inhabited by one Spirit, and was necessarily limited to the members of that Body, that is, the Saints. If they were to be of effect in the world, they must be bound closely together, intensely focused. They must and did trust one another, and to them, preaching their own voluntary Communism, there was no possibility of envy or concupiscence, as each one was thinking rather of what he would *give* than of what he would *receive*, thus again reversing the notions of many people in these later days

"The modern political Communism does not answer to this description, whether in method or in aim, for the reason that secular political Communism and specifically Christian Communism have at present and for the main part very different inspirations

"It is, thirdly, significant that the early Christians were not communists in regard to anything except their goods. There was to be no socialization of the Family, no handing over children at birth to the State, no conception of marriage as 'an association terminable at the will of either party,' no Municipal stud farms. And why was this? It was because in their Communism the Early Christians did not deny the Liberty of the Individual in general, nor did they wish to do anything to prevent even Christians from possessing, or to make possession meaningless or useless. They merely desired to express that Love which they claimed was the expression of the one Life which inhabited and rendered one all the members of the community. So far were they from interpreting their Communism to mean that private ownership was wrong, that

and dubious benefits which were none of their own choosing.

The last point with which we shall deal here, which impressed the Community after Wiseman's losses, was that whether the *capitalist* made a profit or not, the *wage-earner* on whom the capital had been spent received his keep and, in the vast majority of cases, a good bit over, which latter was in the nature of a profit. This the wage-earner would either spend on pleasures, or he would save it and perhaps invest it, either with the Government or in some undertaking of his choice. Thus the workmen who were employed on Wiseman's second bridge (which, as we saw, had never paid, so that the capital sunk in it was lost) being superior and skilled men and in receipt of a good wage, found themselves on the completion of the financially disastrous bridge possessed of savings, in many cases invested and earning a good interest.

To Wiseman, it was left to smile and to look pleasant.

WISEMAN AND THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALISTS

Wiseman's bridges had, however, by no means ruined him. He still had some vessels and also large savings. He was still a man of property and the object of a good deal of criticism, both sincere and insincere.

Certain persons now arose who declared publicly that Wiseman had no right to his private property, because that any property should be private was contrary to the Christian religion. This religion, they said, was communistic, and was wholly pledged to the system of political Communism. In proof of this they quoted the Acts of the Apostles, where the members of the Church of that time are spoken of as having all things in common, no man calling anything his own.

Now there were in Wiseman's country, as in most others, great numbers of people who "used" the Christian

the claims of a religious Body, or still further voluntarily forgo their native individualism by asserting the Authority of the Church. That any persons could claim as *socialistic* the act of joining a Christian religious Body is forcibly contradicted by the more influential and consistent of the socialistic writers themselves.

"A person can be *social* also in endeavouring in his own private capacity to benefit Society. Thus teaching faith and duty to classes, visiting neighbours and teaching them housekeeping, helping them in the matter of their children, of their clubs, of their legal and civic rights, etc (for the list is endless), and above all—as a few quiet helpers here and there are able to do—enlightening and strengthening a whole neighbourhood by the mere light of their countenance, by their own character, faith and hope, is all social work, and yet it is not in the least socialistic.

"No Government has any part or lot in such work as this; no Municipal Body, no 'Soviet' nor Trade Union. If they did take a part in such work, the work would immediately be ruined, becoming impersonal, costly, cumbrous, perfunctory, probably dishonest, certainly lifeless, and inevitably tainted with politics.

"In many other ways can a man be social without being socialistic, and, therefore, it does not follow, as my Socialistic critic suggests, that because as a Christian I am social, that, therefore, I am, or ought to be, also a Socialist."

Another C S.—"Even if the proposed political communism of to-day differs in essentials from that of the Early Church, and to such an extent that that Body cannot be cited as a precedent, and even if private property is not specifically or by name prohibited, yet I maintain that the altruistic *spirit* of Christianity is against it, and that, in consequence, it is already doomed. Thus even Slavery is not specifically condemned in the New Testament or by the Early Church, and yet the evolution of the first Christian principles has now, in these last days,

the disposal of the State When, however, they perceived that it would be indiscreet to assert or admit this departure from their Christian ethics, and when they also perceived that they were not in the awkward presence of students of their literature, they always denied that they entertained any such opinions.

But while, as we have said, there were many people who asserted the authority of Christianity not because they believed in it, but because of the use they thought they could make of it, yet nevertheless there were many who held quite sincerely that modern political Communism was identical with the Communism of the Early Church, and that no social system was compatible with Christianity unless it were communistic. They spoke much and beautifully of "sacrifice" and of "willing surrender"; though this was not always as convincing as it might have been, from the fact that so constantly it was not clear what they themselves (or the majority of them) were going to lose by their reforms, or if indeed they were going to lose anything. But still it was beyond question that among these people there was a great element of sincerity, and so Wiseman felt it his duty to reply to his Christian Socialist critics.

Said *Wiseman*. "It is first to be noted that the early Christians were *voluntary* communists, *i e*, their communism was not merely that of an organized Society who imposed it on each individual by means of force in accordance with the will of the majority, but that it was the spontaneous expression of the Free Will of each Person—each Person being free, at any moment, to keep back anything that he chose Ananias was punished, not because he kept back part of his property, but because he said he had given the whole, and had thus lied to the Church. He was punished for lying and hypocrisy, and not for possessing. 'Whiles it remained, was it not thine own?' was the Apostle's protest. The spirit in that early community

then and there morally right, *because enjoined by the State* ; it was not enjoined by the State because it was morally right This, at least, is the Socialistic view. This law against theft, therefore, not being itself moral in any absolute or *a priori* sense, cannot imply the doctrine of the morality of private property "

Wiseman —" It should be clearly realized that this view of my critic regarding the Eighth Commandment must necessarily apply equally to the whole Decalogue—to the laws, *i e* , against atheism, murder, adultery, lying, and the rest—in which case we might have a very pure Socialism indeed, but one which could by no means be regarded as Christian, and which genuine Christian Socialists would themselves denounce and repudiate.

" Again . The duty of *giving*, which is so strongly emphasized in the New Testament and by the early Christians, would not have been regarded by them as virtuous had there not been (as against the *enforcible* demands of men generally) a corresponding right to possess It was never suggested as a reason for giving, that the possessors of property had no right to their goods and might by giving restore what they should never have taken, and that in so doing they would perform an act of Christian charity. The early Christians regarded the restoration of stolen goods as a virtuous act, but not as an act of Christian charity "

Another C S —" Even if men, because they are men, were possessed individually of rights, including the right to possess and to make agreements, must you not admit that, as a Christian, you are compelled to assert that, nevertheless, it is the duty of Christians—and, may I perhaps also add—of those who though not Christians are in sympathy with a certain part of their morality—to *sacrifice* those rights—*sacrifice* being, as it were, the key-note of the Christian Faith ? "

Wiseman —" Again we must ask our Christian Socialist

St. Paul urged Christians to acquire property of their own, so that they themselves might not be dependent on the charity of the Church,¹ so also that they might maintain their children or parents (not to do so was to be 'worse than an infidel'), and, lastly, that they might be able (freely and of their own will) to give. Where wealth, great or small, had been made honestly, the Christian appeal was always to those who had more, that they should *give*, rather than to those who had less, that they should *take*.

"Our country being, for the main part, either only nominally Christian, or non-Christian, or (as in the case of such a large number of the Socialists, Communists, etc.) intensely anti-Christian, if a Communism were established among us at all, at any rate it would not be a Christian Communism, in the sense of the Acts of the Apostles."

The following dialogue then took place between Wiseman and his Christian Socialist critics.

First Christian Socialist — "But surely you, a Christian, believe in men being 'social,' and what is that but 'Socialism', and, if you so believe, what are you in reality but a 'Socialist'?"

Wiseman — "The adjective belonging to the word Socialism is not the word 'social' but 'socialistic.' Thus the man who chooses to have a wife and children is social, but it would be absurd to say that his action was specifically socialistic, or that he himself was, therefore, a Socialist. The more logical Socialists, as their writings assure us, say that the Family is incompatible with Socialism, and that, therefore, a Socialist who was properly married with a family, was a Socialist only *in spite of* his family tie, and not because of it. Others again can, for instance, be social in their religion, *i.e.*, instead of having a religion each one to himself, they may join and submit to

¹ "He that will not work, neither let him eat," was an instruction to the Church to prevent Christians of no means, but capable of work, from abusing the charity of the Church.

but it is just that kind of duty which cannot be enforced by coercive law or any other organized force. Sacrifice which is compulsory is nonsense, being a contradiction in terms, for there is no sacrifice except *self-sacrifice*—that is, the sacrifice of the self by the self and by nothing else. The talk that in a 'Christian State' the specifically Christian morality should be enforced by the State is entirely meaningless. The State may only use physical violence or the threat of it, for the purpose of enforcing *Right*, and not for the purpose of enforcing the *surrender* of *Right*. The use of force, however, by the State for the enforcement of *Right* is compatible with Christianity, is necessary to its free development as it is necessary to the free development of anything, and is the proper contribution thereto of coercive Law."

Another C.S.—"How can you reconcile inequalities of possessions with that Human Equality which is of the essence of the Christian Faith, and even if you could make such a reconciliation, how will you justify the fact that good people do not necessarily obtain more wealth, *i.e.*, obtain a greater reward, than people who are morally indifferent or perhaps even morally bad, the fact, that is to say, that the inequalities do not necessarily work out more in favour of the specially virtuous people than of the indifferent?"

Wiseman.—"The Personalities of men are indeed equal, so much so that no differences of possessions, intellect, learning, social position or physical power or beauty can affect that equality or be the source or expression of any essential superiorities or inferiorities. By the political Equality of Men, we do not mean the quantitative equality of their possessions, but the equality of their spirits or wills, *i.e.*, the equal honour and sanctity in which the Free Will and self-ownership of all are held. We mean, in short, by the political Equality of Men, the perfection and equality of the Liberty of Men, that Liberty without which there is no Free Will, conscience, judgment, self-respect or mutual

shown it to be immoral. Slavery, moreover, it must be remembered, was a form of private property."

Wiseman — "First: When in the fullness of time Christians consciously and openly objected to Slavery, they did so—not because it was a mode of private property, but because it was an immoral mode, implying, therefore, the existence of a private ownership which was moral."

"Secondly: The grounds on which they objected to Slavery were exactly the same grounds as those upon which they based the Right, or Liberty, to possess private property, namely, the sanctity of the individual, self-determined *Person* (as gradually revealed by Christianity), and the claim he makes on the ground of his Personality and Free Will to *Liberty*, including and involving, of course, the Right or Liberty to possess his own body and not to be made into a Slave. But Personality and Free Will involve not only the Right to possess one's own body, but all forms of Liberty, including inevitably the Right or Liberty to make, to keep, and to conclude agreements according to the judgment of the Person, and so to be something more than a tool or instrument at the disposition of those in power.

"Thirdly: One would have supposed that the Law against theft occurring as one of the Ten Commandments would have afforded guidance to our Christian Socialists. If this law is a *moral* law, the morality of private ownership is implied."

The same C.S. — "But, I say, that it is not a moral law except in the sense that, in the Socialist view, all laws promulgated by the State are moral, and are indeed the *only* morality. This law against theft is, therefore, no more moral, in an absolute sense, than is our law that people must drive to the left rather than to the right—that is to say, it is local and temporary, and is merely a statute imposed by a certain State at a certain time to be there and then for the public convenience. It was

This view of man was—whether for good or ill—radically altered by Christianity. Each man was now regarded as individually, immediately and eternally related to the Absolute, and possessed therefore of an infinite potentiality. The Absolute was revealed as the Father of each and every man, wherefore all men were brethren, sharing equally in the likeness of the Absolute, and consequently of one common absolute or divine nature. In consequence of this the value and sanctity of each individual Self, of each Will, was now seen to be absolute, while the spiritual potentialities of all men soever were perceived to be infinite.

“So we perceive that, while the characteristics of men which were emphasized by the pagan tended to disunion, so the principle asserted by Christianity, of a common Personality and a common divine relation, is a *unifying* principle

“From this it follows that, as in the Christian view, there is neither Greek nor Jew, neither male nor female, so, and this is specially evident, where the persons considered are Christians, there is neither rich nor poor. Though one be employer and another employed, no longer is this the relation of master and slave, of agent and instrument, of despiser and despised; it is a relation of mutual respect between two Persons spiritually equal.

“It is in this spiritual equality alone that we must find any rational or permanent basis for Democracy, Liberty, or Human Equality.

“To conclude. My critic asks how one can justify the fact that inequalities of possessions do not necessarily work out in favour of virtuous people obtaining a greater material reward than that awarded to those who are morally indifferent or even worse.

“To this it must be replied that wealth is not a reward for virtue, or for beauty of character, or for heavenly-mindedness. Were this otherwise, St. Francis need not

critics what they are going to do regarding those citizens who are not Christians in any sense, not even in the sense that they are in sympathy with Christian moral teaching. Secondly, while it must be strongly insisted that the debt which Christian Law and Custom owe to those who, though not definitely Christian, are (and were) deliberately influenced by Christian moral teaching, and by their Christian Social Heredity or Environment in general must never for a moment be forgotten or insolently ignored in pride or envy, yet Christian Socialists must be reminded that those politically disposed persons who repudiate the Faith and Religion of Christians, but 'are in sympathy with a certain part of their morality,' are apt to adopt only that part which they suppose fits in with their theories or prejudices, or with which, for political or other reasons, it pays them to be in sympathy. These latter persons, at any rate, do not contemplate 'self-sacrifice' for themselves, nor does the moral ideal of our Critic in any way apply to them. It must, at the present time and at the cost of whatever unpopularity, be most plainly insisted upon, that the mere desire to share with our neighbour his goods (especially if using coercion, legal or other, for the purpose) does not, in itself, constitute Christianity, nor yet does Christianity consist in our 'sacrificing' the goods of one class and giving them to another, perhaps our own class, while we ourselves, as is generally the case, do not intend to incur any *net* loss whatever. To be virtuous at somebody else's expense is pleasant, popular and easy, but is not Christianity, nor is it compatible therewith. Thirdly, while 'sacrifice' is the duty of the Christian, it must never be forgotten that by 'sacrifice' is always meant 'self-sacrifice'. It is not only in no sense the duty of the Christian to sacrifice other people, but he is actually forbidden to do so, and most emphatically so if he proposes to use force for his purpose.

"To sacrifice their rights may be for Christians a duty,

that he has worked as hard as the great Master, perhaps much harder, and that, therefore, he should receive the same pay. The public has a right to reply, 'This great singer is giving us what we want, and in better quality than you can give it us. Competition demonstrates that you have made a mistake in entering this profession, and are, in consequence, wasting labour which the Nation can ill spare. Your vocal art should be devoted to crying fish.'

"Contrary to socialistic doctrines, there is, in regard to commercial matters, no moral ground on which we can compel people to pay for things that they don't want, or for things that, left to themselves, they can obtain in better quality."

The same C S—"If, then, people are not to be rewarded according to their virtue (in which term, to please you, we include both industry and courage), how do you propose to apportion wealth, *i e*, to determine the *amount* of wealth each citizen is to receive?"

Wiseman—"I have already stated that where real useful wealth has been produced, there is no question of 'rewards,' but only of payment or exchange. These payments or exchanges will, in a free community, vary according to circumstances. Let us take an instance. When I built my first fishing-boats I was able to get men to help me much more cheaply than those who now build most of our ships can get such labour. One reason is that there is now much more wealth in the Country; another is that these labourers have now combined together, have collected an immense capital, and are consequently in a position to make almost any bargain that production will bear. The payment for labour has gone up, and partly owing to that, and partly owing to competition, the payment for capital and brains has gone down. Nor have the shipbuilders necessarily any right to complain.

"There is no pre-determined payment for labour or for

respect, in brief, no spiritual life and no basis for citizenship. Inequalities of earnings are not a defiance of the Equality of Man, but are its inevitable outcome, being the necessary result of free Persons using their very various minds and bodies (the means organic to their self-realization and self-expression) free from molestation or trespass at the hands of their neighbours. Equality is quite a different thing from *Uniformity*, and is indeed incompatible with it.

"Inequality of dimensions or power is but one of the forms of 'Variety,' and variety is inevitably associated with all free or spontaneous life and growth. The case of Man, however, from the point of view of Christian teaching, is different from that of plants or animals. For, in the case of man, underneath all these variations there is the universal Personality of Spirit of Man and common Divine relation. This works in diverse situations through very various brains and bodies as its organic *means*; but whether it is superior or inferior, equal or unequal, is a moral question and not a question of the excellence of these means or of the visible, external or worldly success it has achieved through them. It is a matter of the strength or feebleness, the goodness or the badness, of the Will or Self that lies behind the endeavours.

"To this view of Man, materialism and paganism, both ancient and modern, were and are deeply opposed. Pagans had little, if any, idea of the existence of Human Personality and no idea of its sanctity. Among them a man's intellect, strength, nationality, beauty, birth, even wealth,—*i.e.*, all the things in which men *differ* from one another, and which, in consequence (taken alone and apart from the *uniting* influence of a common Personality) tend to *dis-unite* people,—were just the things the pagan, like the modern materialist or secularist, exclusively emphasized. Indeed, properly speaking, if we accept the noble reverence of the Greek and the Roman for military valour, these things were all that they knew of in regard to a man.

the State is whether the said conduct is *just*—i.e., whether or not it violates the Right or Liberty of the Persons concerned. The State cannot morally employ Force to enforce specifically Christian ethics, as, e.g., the *sacrifice* of Right, but it can morally employ it for the enforcement and maintenance of Right, i.e., of Justice.

"As regards the wages that our successful timber merchants should pay: we have already seen that comparatively large profits made by a successful few are compatible with Justice, and are also economically expedient as they encourage investment, being, as it were, the exceptional plums. If, therefore, all other things being equal, the man who makes a profit in excess of his competitors, or in excess of what he himself was making previously, is to be compelled on Christian grounds to divide that excess among his employees, injustice would be done to the successful man and Force would be put to an immoral use. We should also be doing wrong economically. We should be discouraging enterprise on the one hand, and by preventing occasional high profits, we should be lowering the *average* interest on the total savings invested in the country, and so discouraging investment and encouraging unemployment. In saying this I am, of course (in accordance with the last speaker's question), limiting myself to the kind of case exemplified by our neighbour the timber merchant—the case, that is to say, in which the increased profits are not due to any increased skill or labour on the part of the employees. In such cases it is not evident that the man who employs a given amount and kind of skill and labour with eminent success should be compelled, on moral grounds, to pay more for that skill and labour than the man who is only ordinarily successful pays for the same thing. Although, however, the employees of the timber merchant and of other merchants situated like him do not *necessarily* obtain a direct advantage by means of an increase of wage from an improvement in any

have troubled to be poor, and the Saints should demand payment in proportion to their holiness. Goodness can neither be bought nor rewarded with money.

"Individual wealth in a country where there is any commerce, arises, in the vast majority of cases, from worldly goods received in exchange for worldly gains given; it is this world's pay for this world's gains. Virtues are, generally speaking, involved in the making of wealth, but the wealth is not a 'reward' for those virtues, it is merely material payment for material advantages received. Confining ourselves to purely economic matters, and leaving, therefore, on one side such payments as are made, *e g*, to ministers of religion, artists, etc, we perceive how impossible it is to pay for things merely on account of the virtue or industry or courage of those who produce them. Consider the extremely familiar case of the person who has spent laborious years in inventing something that either is not wanted, or has already been invented long ago; or consider the capitalist who risks his capital in the purchase and manufacture of some such useless invention. It is clear that the market cannot give any payment at all to such people, because, however morally excellent they may be, they are economically futile. The world cannot be compelled to pay cash for virtue and industry as such, but only for such virtue and industry as are productive of such things as have at any moment a definite money value. 'Equal pay for equal work' is an absurd formula if it means merely 'equal *amount* of work.' Even in the world of Art (which is in many ways non-economic) we perceive the inadequacy of this formula. Thus some enterprising but cacophonous person might spend many years in learning to sing, and he might proceed to practise his art in many different places and with much zeal and assiduity. He may, however, find that he makes nothing by it, because, in competition with him, there is a great Master. He may not, however, complain and say

which, if it exists, it is your duty to help to enforce, and then say at the same time, that it is his duty to sacrifice that right and that you will use force to see that he does it. For what do we mean by a right but a liberty, *i.e.*, an immunity from the forcible interference of our neighbour, an immunity which is claimed on moral grounds? A man may sacrifice this or that right of his own, if he chooses, but obviously no one else can do this for him.

"You say that you do not want my money for yourself alone, but also for your class, which, I am aware, in your case means that section of the wage-earners of this country who are organized and richly financed. You claim further to be altruistic on this account, and you do this although you are always using terrible language against the pursuit of their 'class interests' by any other section of the Community. There may, of course, be an element of altruism in your action, but, on the other hand, one cannot blind oneself to two facts - first, that to pursue the interest of one's class is one method (albeit not necessarily illegitimate) of pursuing one's own interest, and, secondly, that it is pleasing to one's pride and conducive to one's comfort and pleasure to live in a class which is ever becoming richer and more powerful.

"You claim that the Faith should become *social* and express itself in legislation. Surely the greatest contribution that the Christian spirit can make to Law is to see that it is active in, and yet *confines itself* to that sphere to which alone its nature and methods apply, namely, to the securing of Right or Justice. The Christian Religion on the one hand and the specifically Christian ethics of love and sacrifice on the other, are wholly beyond the scope of coercive Law.

"Secondly The Faith is already social in a vast number of ways, ways with which the Law is not concerned, but which influence the whole of Life. It has, however, through its spirit and ethics influenced Law also, and has

capital to which people have, as it were, a sort of moral right, though long habituation to a certain payment may cause us to suppose that there is some such *a priori* right. The only *a priori* moral right which any of us have in this matter is to such payment as we receive as a result of agreement; the right to make agreements being a necessary part of that general Right to Liberty demanded by us as Persons, *i.e.* beings endowed with Free Will and Judgment

“Economic Law will determine the maximum payments that people can variously receive compatibly with industrial progress. Nor in a country where bargaining is in actual fact and practice legally and economically free could there be any harshness or injustice in this. Thus, if the combinations of wage-earners use their power unwisely and demand a wage too high for the work done, we know from our observation of Economic Law that either people who save will proceed to invest abroad, or if they are circumvented in this, they will not invest at all—that is to say, they will invest abroad, or they will dissipate their savings, instead of promoting by their means productive (*i.e.* wage and commodity-producing) enterprises.”

Another C S —“Are you aware, Wiseman, that in this town there is a man who recently purchased a device for sawing timber for the shipbuilders? This, unlike most such experiments, has proved a success. Are you aware that though, as a result, he is now making a considerably greater profit than his competitors, yet, nevertheless, he is continuing to pay only the same wage to his men as he paid before, and as is being paid by his competitors? Can you defend this as moral, and as expressive of Christian Brotherhood, and as a thing to be permitted under our Law?”

Wiseman —“Whether an action or course of conduct is specifically Christian or not, is not the affair of the State, being beyond the purview of coercive Law. The question for

quite untrue. Were this otherwise, the Gospel—for whomsoever else it might be Good News—would not be Good News for the poor.”

Another CS—“I quite agree with Wiseman that capital is only money which the owner thereof has invested instead of spending. But I myself am a Christian Socialist because I interpret the New Testament teaching to mean that we must not ‘save’ nor ‘take thought for the morrow,’ but must live from day to day trusting in an ever-present, ever-gracious Providence.”

Wiseman—“I have already shown that even though a person saves and invests, he is always at liberty to hand over his investments to charities or public Institutions. But leaving that on one side, the Socialist notion, that by merely adopting the easy course of not saving, a person is carrying into practice a New Testament principle, is very far from the spirit of the said New Testament teaching. Thus such a person might, in reality, not be putting his trust in Providence at all, but only in the State and its power and willingness to provide for him out of the intelligence and labour, and perhaps savings, of others. That such an attitude is compatible with an anti-Christian or even atheistic position, is revealed by the writings of some of the greatest Socialists themselves.”

There arose now one to speak, who having, as a Socialist begun by denying the Right of the Individual, had, very logically, proceeded to deny the Right of the Community. He perceived that the Community was constituted of Individuals and could, therefore, have no *a priori* moral Right, seeing that its constituent individuals had none.

“All institutions, including the State,” said this person, “can be exploited by the capitalist, and, therefore, all institutions should be abolished.”

Wiseman.—“Often have I analysed this saying, and have found that it only expresses a certain vague envy and consequent hatred of capitalists, *i e.*, of those who possess

business, yet, through that and other forms of commercial progress, they obtain, together with the rest of the Community, an *indirect* advantage through the cheapening of goods which ultimately takes place. Thus the timber merchant's employees will benefit with the rest of the public in the cheapening of their fish and of their imported goods, due to the cheapening of the building of ships, resulting from the timber merchant's new methods of treating ship timber. In the same manner will they benefit by improved methods introduced into yet other business by merchants as enterprising and able as the timber merchant whose methods we are discussing " (Appendix B)

Another C.S. — "I am still not perfectly clear as to your attitude towards Christian ethics in the matter of charity. Surely, Wiseman, if there is a Christian Command that we are to give, it means that you are to give me *and my class* (you see I am altruistic) all or most of your possessions. If you admit this Command to be indeed a Christian duty incumbent upon all men, why cannot it be recognized by the State and enforced by coercive Law? Do we not want the Christian Faith to cease from being a merely *individual* matter as formerly, and to become now a *social* matter, expressing itself in our social organization but especially in our legislation?"

Wiseman — "I have often heard this argument before in various forms, and I am aware that it is to be taken seriously. Whether actions are Christian or not is a question of the *spirit* in which they are done. Communism, giving, sacrifice, are only Christian if done by Christians because they are Christians, or, at any rate, by persons exclusively actuated by the Christian doctrine of love and self-sacrifice. If you coerce legally or otherwise a possessor into giving you his goods, the possessor, at any rate, as you will admit, is not doing a specifically Christian act, but then neither are you. You cannot say that your possessing neighbour has a right to his possessions, a right

product of the sale a share or partnership in a very large farm, a long way off, which was full of promise but required money for its development. The sale by Wiseman of his businesses provided exactly the money required for the purchase of the partnership. On the estate were a few small subsidiary businesses, such, *e.g.*, as a wheelwright, a brick kiln, a cooper, a forge, which only required money in order to enable them to do a large business in the neighbourhood—a neighbourhood which had long suffered from the want of such industries. In Wiseman's mind, one of the advantages of this partnership was that he would not be expected to take an active part in the management of the estate.

He was not, however, even here to be permitted to rest long in peace. A new critic—a Socialist—arose who attacked Wiseman in public, and the following dialogue took place:—

The Critic.—"What right have you, Wiseman, to money from this estate? What do you yourself do for it that gives you a right to any of its product?"

Wiseman.—"I do not know in what sense my critic uses the word 'right.' He is a logical Socialist, and has always denied the existence of any moral *a priori* right on the part of the individual. On the contrary, he has always asserted that all right has its origin in the State, *i.e.* (for all practical purposes) in the will of what, at any moment, is the politically dominating section of the people—in other words, in the will of the Government. According to my critic, a thing is right if it is decreed by the State, the judgment of the State being, for Socialists, the sole criterion of right and wrong. Indeed, for my critic to assert anything else would be subversive of logical Socialism. When I assert, therefore, that my share in this farm was obtained with the full knowledge, sanction, protection and even encouragement of the State, I have fully answered my socialistic critic as to my 'right' to that share."

inspired legislation to an extent which only students of Law and History can fully appreciate."

Another C S — "Personally I am a Christian Socialist, not because I believe possessing to be contrary to the Christian Faith, nor because I believe in any sort of 'compulsory sacrifice,' but because I do not believe the poor can be noble or virtuous. Like all Socialists, I have a theory that by abolishing possessors, the poor will cease to be poor, and, true again to my Socialism, I also hold that sins committed by the poor are due to their poverty, and that if you abolish poverty you abolish 'degradation.' Consider the conditions of life of the destitute and semi-destitute, and tell me, Wiseman, how you yourself would have turned out under such conditions?"

Wiseman — "It is an astonishing thing to me to hear, on one day, a Socialist criticizing possessors, large and small, as proud, selfish, dishonest and bad men who owe their spiritual degradation to their possessions, and then the next day to listen to another Socialist (or perhaps even the same one) declaring that the poor are sinful and degraded, and that this is because of their poverty; that if they could have what greater possessors have, or (by means of a Communistic State) its equivalent in leisure, pleasure and comfort, they would even transcend the existing possessors in respectability, virtue and loftiness of character.

"Leaving, however, this contradiction on one side, let us proceed to make clear to ourselves what we mean by 'the poor.' We must beware of the false logic which argues that 'the destitute are poor, therefore the poor are destitute.' The destitute are under normal conditions a small minority, and their condition is too often due to themselves or their parents. We must, at present, consider only that large majority of the men of this country, namely, the economically efficient wage-earners. That these people do not and cannot lead decent and good lives is

reason there is anything left over for others is that there are other factors involved in production besides labour, and without which the labour would be valueless. Thus there are possessors—or capitalists as we often call them—like myself, who render it possible to employ and to organize wage-earners, and there are managers and clerks who, by the knowledge they possess, the responsibility they can support and the control they can exercise, render that labour valuable. Both possessors and managers are in their positions as survivors out of a multitude who have failed to become such or to succeed as such. They have spent a great deal of time and a great deal of money on their education and training, their individual responsibility is heavy, while the increased effectiveness of modern labour (as compared with barbaric labour) and the consequently increased wage, are due, to an enormous extent, to capital and management. In theory, the State or Local Body¹ could, by conscripting wages, become a capitalist (the one and only), and could, through its officials, exercise all management. But experience shows that Government officials tend to be selected and promoted on lines of nepotism, bribery and politics, rather than on account of their proven moral and intellectual excellence; that in the absence of competition there is, in the world of commerce, no means of *creating* efficient men, nor, on the other hand, of *ascertaining* what men are actually efficient, and *in what degree* they are so; and that in the absence of any interest on the part of the Government, or of any real pressing personal interest on the part either of the officials or their workmen in the success of any one particular industry, indifference, idleness, dishonesty, inefficiency, and, worst of all, *electroneering economics*, tend to become the order of the day, and to become so increasingly, as with the passage of time the memories of the superior standards of the free commercial enterprise of the

¹ Or Soviet!

Remembering that all people who have saved money are capitalists, this saying places us in the absurd position of asserting that all institutions must be abolished, because they can be utilized by and are of use to *all* the citizens, *not excluding* those who have saved money. We are asked to agree that because these latter are not, and cannot be, excluded, therefore the institutions should be abolished. No doubt those who make money and save it and invest it make a greater use of certain kinds of institutions than do others, but as we have seen that is not to the detriment of those others, nor yet of the institutions. The hidden implication in this saying of our friend is that institutions are not of use except to those who have saved and invested money. That institutions, and those products and conveniences which arise from them and flourish under them, are of use to all, is on all sides abundantly evident, not only in the health, security and business of the people, but also in their conveniences and pleasures.

"It is argued that the Family itself is an 'institution,' and that this is 'exploited' by the capitalist for the purpose of transmitting wealth. Leaving on one side the exact sense in which we are entitled to speak of the Family as an 'institution,' there remains the fact that men, capitalists or others, do not desire a family in order that they may transmit wealth, but they desire to transmit wealth because they have a family. The idea of inheritance is inherent in the idea of the Family, and, therefore, it is that the Family is the strongest incentive to making, saving and investing which the mind of Man can conceive. The Family, however, is not 'instituted' for the purpose of transmitting wealth, nor is it 'exploited' when wealth is transmitted through it and because of it."

[This Debate between Wiseman and his Critics here ended]

Advancing years now induced Wiseman to sell the various industries he had created, and to buy with the

part, you yourself are, or were, a sailor and shipbuilder. May I ask in what conceivable sense you claim that such things as cornfields, forges, brickworks, and the other industries here, from which you now receive profit, are expressions of your Personality or Character; and, if these things are not such expressions, how on your own principles can you defend your taking a part of the product, *i.e.*, having a share in them? "

Wiseman — "If a man were living absolutely alone on an inaccessible, uninhabited island, he would be content with a thousandth part of the things he requires living in a Society. In such isolation, the actual things themselves, which he obtained or made, would be the things he wanted to use and to keep, and these things would be the bare necessities of life. Directly, however, that the smallest and simplest Society arises, there arises also a desire for something more than mere necessities, the reason being that human intercourse enormously increases our self-realization and need for self-expression. Questions of elegance in costume, food, housing, etc., now arise. Matters of art, education, religion, the social position of himself and his family, and many other things, begin now to concern each individual man. Differentiation or specialization of labour now sets in, and men cease to desire to keep the actual articles they themselves have made, or (leaving artists, poets and other such non-commercial or non-economic persons on one side) to regard them as being in themselves, and in any special sense, expressions of their characters or Personalities. Thus the blacksmith here does not desire the numerous horseshoes that he makes, he only desires that power to buy the labour or produce of others which their need for his horseshoes, and the money payments they make to him on account of them, will give him. The economic expression, therefore, of the character or Personality of the blacksmith is to be found in the *fact* of his wealth, the *amount*

The Critic.—"While it is true that I, as a logical or unqualified Socialist, cannot, of course, believe in Personality and the independent moral or divine right inherent in that idea, yet you, Wiseman, do believe in all this. Let us hear, therefore, how you defend yourself on your *moral* grounds. I consider I have a right to make this demand."

Wiseman—"On your own socialistic principles you yourself can have no 'right' or claim of any sort against anyone unless the State has expressly given it to you. You at least have therefore not the 'right to make this demand,' which you imagine you have. As, however, most of those here present are not Socialists, but hold, on the contrary, that 'Right' and 'rights' have their origin, not in speculations of Governments regarding the Good of the Whole, but in the moral characteristics of Personality, I will make the following statement. It will be exceedingly brief, as I have already dealt with this matter elsewhere. First: Freedom to make and to keep is an expression of our Free Will. Secondly: Freedom to make agreements with our neighbours, regarding such making and the products of such making, is also an expression of our Free Will. Deprived of these two expressions, our Free Will, and, therefore, our Personality, are so far stultified. Thirdly, and in consequence, what we make is an expression of our Personality, and we claim it not only as an expression of our Free Will, but also as being, like our bodies (by means of which it is made), a medium through which our Free Will functions and is realized."

The Critic—"Do then the wage-earners on your estate claim and get all that is made by them? If so, how is it there is anything left for you, who make nothing?"

Wiseman—"I verily believe the labourers on the estate are paid everything which can be regarded as their own contribution to the total product of the estate. The

they owe me a debt—not a debt of gratitude, but a debt capable of exact expression in cash, and bearing a relation to the money gain they themselves make from taking and using my goods. Needless to say, they do not give me the whole of their gain, but only a part. This new kind of plough, which we have been turning out at our forge here, is a case in point. They are more efficient, but also more expensive than the old kind. If I were to demand the whole of the gains, *i.e.*, if I were to charge so high a price that customers could make no extra saving by the purchase, they would not buy the article. In other words, it pays them to pay me.”

The Critic —“Do you, Wiseman, then take the (for you) easy and comfortable view that we are living in a world of prosperity and economic justice that cannot be improved upon and needs no reform?”

Wiseman —“No, I am very far from holding that view, but, on the other hand, I refuse to abandon an ideal merely because at many times and places we come short of its attainment.

“I have, for instance, visited of recent times certain other countries where the economic system is not as good as is ours, and indeed is such that my sorrow was aroused at finding that a not inconsiderable number of workers of every class in the Community could not be said to *make a profit or gain* from their labour or business transactions—*i.e.*, certain persons worked their hardest and yet were only just able to live; not even the most self-controlled among them being able to save and invest or insure. These persons existed in all classes of the community, but they were the more superficially evident, and also very much more heard of, among the manual workers.

“I found that this condition of things was due to four causes. Thus, in one Country the ground was extremely unproductive both in the matter of plants and minerals. This caused a low recompense for labour and so a low grade

past become dim, and to a socialistic generation almost hateful in their virility. (Appendix C.)

" Apart, however, from such considerations of mere expediency, to deprive men, by coercion, of the freedom to make, to keep, and to effect agreements, is to deprive them of much of the Liberty essential to Personality. Ideally speaking (and leaving inheritance, for the present, on one side), a man's possessions are expressions of his Personality, of his intelligence, energy, patience and courage, and are (even and perhaps especially if he gives them away in charity) a medium of his self-realization. To stultify possession, therefore, or to deny the freedom to possess, is to attack Personality, that is, to attack Right, and so, in the interests of utilitarian speculation, to enlist the Government and the Law in the service of Wrong. I conclude, therefore, by saying that, ideally speaking, everybody has a right to what he obtains in a free market. My critic's position is really an attack upon property in general. For if the saver and investor of money is not entitled to payment, neither is the most useful and efficient labourer entitled to better pay than the least useful. Both labourers must, of course, receive a wage to live on, but the first man must not receive pay on account of his superior economic value, *i e*, if the *mere hours of labour* spent in an industry is to be the sole consideration in the making of payments, and the only thing that is to be paid for. If, on the contrary, a man's *economic value* is to be a principal factor in his economic wage or payment, a man who brings intellect or capital to originate or assist a business must be paid for on account of that. Wherefore it is evident that there is justly and properly a gain for those who save and invest, and for those that work with their brains, as well as for manual workers "

The Critic—" You, Wiseman, have talked here and elsewhere of possessions as being an expression of the Personality or Character of the possessor. For the main

on the part of the wage-earners which prevents them obtaining the whole of that share in the product which is economically justifiable

"Whether this state of things exists or not; and if it does exist, what adjustment is to be made, must depend less upon emotion, gambling guesswork and politics than upon reason, economic knowledge and experience.

"In a fourth Country that I visited, I was able to perceive that low wages were not due to underpayment (by which I mean the paying of less than is justified by the general economic position of any trade in question), i.e., they were not invariably due to workers (of whatever class) not making a good profit on their labour or their transactions, but were due frequently to the fact that the labour given was first either of very low economic value, i.e., it was of poor quality, and, secondly, that it was constantly very limited in quantity. As regards *quantity*: If, e.g., I myself were to begin working in our forge for the blacksmith here, and I said I would only work two days a week, or I would work five days but only for six hours per diem, or that I would work six days but only make one shoe a day,—however good a blacksmith I was, I could not expect the business to be able to afford me permanently a large weekly wage. It might be done temporarily by putting up prices against the public. But by the time all other labourers in all other industries had followed my very foolish example, the general diminution of products (i.e., of wealth) in the Country would be so great that there would be nothing wherewith to buy our now priceless horse-shoes. Products being now so scarce, the purchasing power of money would be extremely small, and we should all be very poor. As regards *quality*, the same small wage would result. I personally should be a very incompetent blacksmith, and my horse-shoes (however industrious I might be) would presumably only fit abnormally constructed horses, and them only by accident. In brief, my services,

of his wealth, and the *uses* to which he puts it, rather than in the actual horseshoes which he has made

"As it is with the blacksmith, so is it with me. Years ago I made *things*, and I made also a *business*, neither of which would, at that time, have existed apart from my Personality. When I sold these things the money I received was the economic expression of my Character, and the use I made of it was a further expression. For while men of weak character would have yielded to the temptation to enjoy and dissipate this money, and men of very different character might have dispensed it in charity, I myself considered that, at the present time and place, the greatest good would be done to my family (I have children to follow after me) and to the country at large, by investing the money in the promotion of productive industry, thereby not only providing money for the poor, but also, at the same time, increasing the amount of commodities for the general use and consumption¹. The public, however, does not pay me because of my Personality or my Character, or because such goods of mine as they want, are the economic expression of my Character, and of the Liberty claimed by and essential to my Personality. This is merely the *moral* ground on which the State secures me in my economic freedom. The reason my customers pay me is that, having had economic advantages from me,

¹ While there would obviously have to be many exceptions, it would seem to be wiser for those who, by testament or otherwise, would benefit their Country by large gifts of capital to Institutions, Churches, Colleges, etc., to do so by handing over *securities* of which the recipients might only use the interest. Otherwise by dissipating capital and permitting it to be expended non-productively, they may find that by causing unemployment and so scarcity of commodities, they have worked the public an injury as well as a benefit.

There is hardly any limit, on the contrary, to the extent to which, without any danger of injuring productive employment, gifts could be made to the public on the principle suggested above.

sympathetically and intelligently exposed: namely, that persons who save and invest are the enemies of those who do not; that the less work a man does the more work and wages are there for some one else; that what one man makes another man loses; and that the Christian Faith insists on our forbidding our neighbour to possess. These are but a few of the matters.

"This, however, is not the time or place to embark upon questions of Social Reform. It is sufficient in answer to my Critic that I state that I am aware that reforms, in many and very various directions, are necessary, as indeed they always will be required while we inhabit this earthly plane. But, on the other hand, I will not allow that my ideal, and my Nation's ideal, of Personal Right or Liberty, and of the duty of each Person to claim that Right, if not for himself, at any rate for his fellow-citizens, is wrong and is to be overthrown. The ideal itself is right, and it is we who do not sufficiently live up to it who are wrong. What we require to do is not to correct our ideal, but to correct ourselves—not our neighbours (that is pleasant, and, in these days, even profitable), but each one his own Self and his secret egotism."

[This Discussion here ended.]

A few more years passed over Wiseman's now grey head, when he was called to leave this world. Following the custom of his Country, he took nothing with him, but left all to his Son.

At this the Socialists were disturbed anew. Son, therefore, agreed to attend a meeting, where, in answer to questions, he should justify his position from the point of view of Right and Wrong. Like his father, he discussed questions of "utility," the "Good of the Whole," and the "Good of the Individual" only when such seemed in some measure involved in a defence of *Right*. He argued that all simple and sane men can recognize what is right, but

however honest and assiduous, and however high their *moral* value, would have only a very small *economic* value, and, therefore, if the business were not to fail financially, I could not expect the blacksmith to pay me the same wage as he was paying to men who were more productive. If the business is not to fail as such, the blacksmith has, among other things, to provide for interest on his own capital, interest on borrowed capital, and his own salary as manager, and for a reserve fund for repairs and enlargements. He must, therefore, watch carefully to see what each labourer contributes to the business in order to decide what is the maximum that he is economically justified in paying to each one. In this fourth Country I perceived that, in order to improve such wages as were depressed by low *quality* or deliberately restricted *quantity* of work, much could be done by a system of education at once more *social* (not more *socialistic*) and also more technical than that prevailing. Young citizens should be taught to use their *faculties*, notably those of conscience, self-determination or control, and reason. As regards the last, there should be placed before them the more obvious truths of political economy, that they might be tempted to listen to facts rather than to seductive promises. Much also might be done by private persons. That is to say, the better educated, especially those with any money to spare, instead of talking such a lot to people already in agreement with them, might corporately organize, throughout the Nation, a campaign of education—historical, economic and ethical. Nothing was more astonishing to me in this Country of which I speak, than the fact that while the Socialists and Anarchists of that Land (albeit they had less intelligence, less power of discipline and less money) altogether outdistanced their opponents in the organization and energy of their propaganda. Especially in the matter of economics must such attractive, but mischievous, teachings as the following be systematically,

situation. My critic and myself are in precisely the same moral position

"If we believe in the Family, in its moral foundation, in its 'solidarity' or spiritual and vital unity, we shall see in it not only the basis of the *State*, but also the moral justification for the *inheritance of wealth*. Without embarking at all on the philosophy and history of the Family in its above aspects, two things can be said regarding inheritance which will be accepted by all ingenuous and unsophisticated people, namely, that the idea of inheritance in the widest and fullest sense of the word is wholly inseparable from the idea of the Family; and, secondly, that what a man has made or saved belongs (*i.e.*, as far as the enforceable claims of his neighbours are concerned) to his own children rather than to the children of other people; and failing his children, to his brethren and their children. Bequests to other kinds of persons or to public and semi-public Institutions do not, for the present, concern us.

"The Socialist objection that Family inheritance of possessions is unjust, is without meaning unless all Family inheritance is unjust. Leaving on one side purely congenital inheritances of mind or body, let us consider those inheritances which have to do with the parents' *character and conduct*. It is the covert and false Individualism of socialistically-minded people that causes them to think it unreasonable that the children of a good man should not start better than those of a bad one. The Psalmist says that he never saw the righteous man forsaken, nor his seed begging their bread. At any rate, *under normal conditions*, beggars are not largely recruited from good folks or their children. Leaving out of consideration that minority of men who live by thought and intellect, let us consider only those whom the Psalmist had probably most in view, namely, the great mass of wage-earners and manual workers generally. It will be found that, on the whole, and abnormal accidents apart, the ranks of the beggars

that they differ greatly as to what constitutes the "Good of the Whole," or the "Good of the Individual," and also as to what conduces to those Goods.

. It will be seen that swift progress in organization and material things had been made by the Community since Wiseman began life. This advance was noticeable, not only in the labour, business and security of the people, but also in the number and quality of their conveniences and pleasures. Thus Wiseman had left to his son a vessel merely for pleasure purposes, what we should call a yacht. Indeed, it was this yacht which was the immediate occasion of the following discussion between Son Wiseman and the Socialists.

A Socialist — "How do you, Son, justify your possession of so many luxuries? Is it not both unjust and economically injurious that you should inherit, for instance, a yacht? Have you earned it? Or do you work so much harder than any of us that you are entitled to it? I ask boldly and plainly, why should you have a yacht, while I, who work harder than you, have to do without?"

Son — "I am aware that when this sort of question is asked one is supposed to bow one's head, and with eyes to the ground to murmur, 'How this great man goes to the inmost truth and soul of things; how he pierces through conventions! Who shall hide himself from the piercing intellect of these Socialists, and from their pure and terrible righteousness which judgeth all things?'

"But the answer is, in reality, perfectly simple. It was simple to all past generations and it is still simple to the great, but silent, mass of our own generation. Take the last speaker himself as an instance. It is true he does not inherit horses and yachts, but his father left him a donkey and cart, the inheriting of which presents to him no difficulties. That he is, as I know, in a good job and prefers to let the donkey and cart, and employ with the proceeds a man to cultivate his garden for him, in no way alters the

extremely large or extremely small. That is to say, that the man who leaves the product of his character and activities to his children does not injure the offspring of the man who leaves his children nothing. They are no worse off because the others are better off ; no one is worse off because this or that person, instead of dissipating his wages or salary, has saved them and perhaps invested them in productive industry, or with an Insurance Company.

"If we choose to regard inheritance as immoral and to forbid individuals the freedom to transmit what they have made, there are only two courses open to us to pursue. Either the State must forbid the personal making and saving of money altogether—that is to say, it must make itself the sole capitalist and producer, raising its capital by means of conscripted labour or wages, and substituting the lash and the jail for the present moral and economic incentives to labour ; or, if people be allowed to make and to save, we must expect to see them deliberately, of set purpose and as a virtue, dissipate, before they die, the whole of any wealth they had accumulated¹ Against the necessity of this latter alternative it might be contended that a possessor might, in his own lifetime, hand over his possessions to his relations (or to other objects of his choice) by deed of gift. But most small possessors would be unwilling to do this in any case, and larger possessors for the main part would not do it without legal guarantee on the part of the recipients that they (the donors) would, until death, be provided for in their wonted style of living, by the recipients. The recipients would in this way become merely legal trustees. That, however, the State would set up such a system for the sole purpose of thwarting its own enactments, aimed, as these would be, at the abolition of inheritance, it is impossible to suppose."

¹ This latter course has already, in England and America, been proposed by Socialists as being morally and economically sound.

are not recruited from the 'righteous' among the manual workers, nor yet from among their children. The children of good parents inherit from their parents a good bringing up, a certain wisdom and knowledge, an inspiring example, and a strange influence of mere *character*, the influence that is, not so much of what a person says or does, as of what he or she *is*. Lastly, they inherit an atmosphere of natural, spontaneous, inevitable respect and mutual affection—the sound basis of self-respect and, therefore, of respect for all their fellow-citizens, the basis, therefore, of patriotism and good citizenship, and so of the love of all mankind.

"Is this all immoral and unjust? Because the children of a good man have this inheritance of character, are the children of bad parents, on that account, in a worse plight? If we say, with the greater (and more logical) Socialists, that it *is* unjust, and that the cure for the injustice is to be found in the abolition of the Family and the handing over at birth of all children to the State to be brought up 'equally,' *i.e.*, as a mass of homogeneous, unrelated individuals, we shall be shutting our eyes to the fact that, under such an arbitrary and artificial bringing up, whatever 'equality' we got, we should get no individuality or character at all. All that respect for ourselves as Persons and *respect for the Personality of others* which has its origin and support in the Family as Christianity has made it, would be lacking, the decrees of the State, which is an assembly of moral beings or Persons, would, in the course of time—a very brief time—come to have no morally binding character; the State would only exist by means of the force of the strongest section, whose selfish desires it would alone represent; and the fruit of it all would be dissolution, social decomposition and putrefaction—that is to say, Anarchy.

"As it is with the inheritance of character and good prospects, so is it with the inheritance of wealth, be that

or another among the wage-earners, a severe check would at once be given to production—*i e*, there would at once arise an increase in unemployment and a diminution of commodities, owing to the check given to saving and investing. These people, who save up a capital from their incomes, would, of course, still be entitled to those incomes even if they were to live from hand to mouth and expend their earnings in a luxurious consumption of labour and commodities. Such persons do not, however, do this. We must reflect, on the other hand, that were the earnings of these saving classes divided up week by week (in doles, subsidies, inflated wages or otherwise) among the wage-earners, these earnings or incomes would then almost certainly be very largely spent by the wage-earning recipients on immediate consumption of commodities, instead of being invested in the promotion of new industries or the enlargement or improvement of those that exist. If we were to deduct from the business-incomes of the middle classes the amount which they *invest*, and consider only the labour and commodities they actually consume in luxuries (*over and above* the amount so consumed by an industrious *wage-earner*), the amount of this labour and commodities measured in money would be so small that even if it were, in some way, divided up week by week among the wage-earners, the sum which each would receive would be too modest a matter to be worth considering by the modern wage-earner.

"Consider now (*b*), *i e*, that the better off in the Community do not *consume* even in proportion to their expenditure.

"*Expenditure of money does not necessarily involve consumption at all*, while even when it does involve consumption, the expenditure of money, among the better off, is in the majority of cases in excess (perhaps vastly so) of the value of the labour consumed or of the value (measured in labour) of the consumed commodities."

Another Socialist—"Without considering further the rights and the wrongs of making, investing or inheriting wealth, does it not seem to you very dreadful and even brutal that certain people should be entitled to consume fifty or a hundred times more commodities per annum than are consumed by even a well-paid wage-earner?"

Son—"In a well-ordered State, what a man actually *consumes*, be it much or be it little, is not more, though it may easily be less, than the money equivalent of the economic use which he (through his labour, intellect or capital) has been to the Community. In the economic world you will not get anything for nothing, and larger consumers are no more exceptions to this rule than are the smaller.

"As regards this question of the consumption of labour and commodities, it is important to remember that under our modern economic and social conditions, the better off among the Community do not *consume* in proportion (a) to their wealth, nor even (b) in proportion to their expenditure

"First let us consider (a) Many people who are in receipt of an income in excess of their absolute necessities, do not *consume* this excess in the ordinary sense at all. This is true not only of persons of great wealth, but also of the more highly-paid wage-earners, also of clerks, professional men and business men. That is to say, a part of the income or earnings of these and other kinds of people are not consumed, but are paid away in *taxes*, or are *invested* in productive industries, either their own industries or those of others¹ It is very important to remember this fact when we listen to all the easy talk that goes on regarding the 'distribution of wealth.' If the business incomes of the middle-class people above mentioned, instead of being invested, were divided up by some means

¹ In the term "productive industries" are included, of course, all things also which *facilitate* production, such, e.g., as ships, railways and all means of transport,

had, unlike A himself, been guilty (from a National point of view) of waste, *i.e.*, needless consumption of labour or commodities, while A had been guilty not of any consumption of labour or commodities, but merely of parting wantonly with the domestic funds. A's wife had also, of course, wantonly parted with domestic funds, but her sin against the *Home* was much less than that of A, while her sin against the *Nation* (in view of her consumption of goods and labour) was much greater.

A now goes forth to his club and buys and smokes a 3s cigar, a remarkable new kind of cigar *grown in England*. His wife tells him that he has not only sinned against domestic economy by wantonly parting with 3s of the domestic funds, but he has also sinned against National Economy by consuming 3s. worth of labour and commodities. A, however, explains that this kind of cigar, until quite recently, cost only 6d¹. It had rare merits, which, *on becoming known*, caused a great demand for the cigar. The land on which that particular tobacco could be grown being very limited, up went the price. In other words, the sellers would only part with this 6d. cigar to those persons who would give them a premium of 2s 6d; *i.e.*, 2s. 6d out of the 3s now charged represented mere 'monopoly value'. The 2s 6d was merely a present given by the buyer to the seller, and represented no consumption of labour or commodities. That is to say, the cigar cost no more to produce at 3s than it had done at 6d., and so the payment of the 2s 6d premium (while it left A's family poorer) did not detract from the wealth or resources of the Nation². To give one more typical instance of expenditure which represents mere monopoly value or premium paying: A goes to a certain fashion-

¹ And most of that was profit and taxation—not labour.

² It must be remembered that the cigar had been grown in England, and that the money paid as premium therefore remained in this country.

[Son Wiseman here gave some instances of the truth of this statement. These, however, it will be better to leave alone, taking, in their stead, instances from our own modern times. Let us suppose one A, during the Great War, went to see in the house of a certain B a picture—an Old Master. A desires to buy this, and he offers B £1000 for it, which B accepts. A now carries the picture home with him. A's wife is angry, and scolds A for wasting so much money, and consuming so much on luxury in War-Time. An Economist, however, who happens to be staying with the A's, explains to A's wife that from the point of view of the Community at large, *i.e.*, from the point of view of National Political Economy, there has been no waste whatever either of money, labour or commodities. A's wife now learns, for the first time, that individual or private economy is not the same thing as political economy, for, as the Economist explains, it is a matter of indifference to the State whether A has the money and B the picture, or *vice versa*. There having been, in spite of the money A paid for the picture, no consumption of labour or goods, as far as the State and the wealth of the Country is concerned, the position from the point of view of National Economy is exactly the same as though no transaction had taken place. It must be remembered that in individual or domestic economy the individual contains within himself on any particular occasion either buyer or seller, but the large home, *i.e.*, the Nation, contains both, on the same occasion and in regard of the same transaction.

The War, as we have said, being still on at the time and National Economy a necessity, it was further explained to A's wife that a certain "joy-ride" she had taken the day before on a motor omnibus, and which had cost 2s, represented nearly 2s. worth of consumption of petrol, machinery, road-surface and labour. She then having needlessly and unproductively consumed National Wealth

element that increases price or expenditure while the consumption remains the same. In A's expensive restaurant the chef is very skilled and much sought after; he, therefore, demands a premium over and above the market rate of cooks' wages from the firm that employs him. Thus the clients pay, together with a further monopoly premium charged by the Firm. Now a good cook does not waste more food than a bad one—the reverse even is the case. So, although the premium charged by the cook or cooks finds its way all right into A's bill, yet even in regard to this element in A's expenditure, A cannot be said to have consumed more than if the cooks had been bad and his bill had been less.

A great variety of things, not involving consumption, enter in to enhance prices. Thus, to take A's restaurant again. There are fashions in restaurants as in most other things. For the moment A's restaurant is frequented by titled people, and, as is well known, numbers of people of all classes will pay a premium in order to sun themselves in such presences.]

The same Socialist—"Do you then, Son Wiseman, pretend that the extra expenditure of the rich involves no increased consumption? And are you prepared openly to defend extravagant expenditure, not only when that does not involve consumption, but even when it does?"

Son Wiseman—"Some of the luxury expenditure, not only of the rich, but of all people who have money to spare, undoubtedly involves a corresponding consumption of labour or commodities. But it will be found that the more advanced a Nation is, the greater is the proportion of the expenditure, especially among the richer classes, which does not involve consumption of labour or goods. Thus in the matter of the arts, even in our simple but advancing country, people are now willing to pay more for good pictures than for bad. The many bad artists are being compelled to demand less for their pictures, and the few

able restaurant in the neighbourhood of Piccadilly. He there has an ordinary meal of ordinary things, but he pays six times the price he would have paid had he consumed the same materials in the same amount, at some popular eating-house. But he has not *consumed* six times as much as the man in the street, he has, on the contrary, consumed exactly the same. The explanation is to be found in the matter of monopoly values. Thus the rent of the fashionable restaurant is very much higher. It is situated on a spot greatly sought after by the great restaurant firms, and the landowner can, therefore, by putting one applicant against another, compel the lessee to pay for the use of the place a high monopoly premium, *i.e.*, a high rent, which rent the lessee gets out of his well-to-do customers by charging them a premium on what they consume. Imagine, for instance, that four persons were to hire the grounds of the Zoo in order to have afternoon tea there; suppose that these persons require no attendance, and the Zoo authorities charge them £1000 rent for the afternoon. Each of the four consumes, we shall say, 8d worth of tea and buns. Four other people that day have tea together in a popular and cheap tea-shop. In such places customers consume, in labour and food, almost the equivalent of the sum they pay. These four persons spend a shilling each over their tea. They are pleased at their own restraint, and rebuke the Zoo party for being so unpatriotic (it was still War-Time) as to spend £1000, 2s 8d of the National wealth over their afternoon tea. The Zoo party, however, point out that what they themselves had *consumed* was only 2s. 8d., whereas their critics had consumed and annihilated close on four shillings' worth.¹

Rent, however, is not the only, or chief, monopoly

¹ I am regarding the Zoo as an independent factor ;—a thing that would be there just as it is, whether the tea-party took place or not. The tea-party is a unique accident, and has no relation to the existence of the Zoo

to the great University that all the good men in our Country are struggling so hard to found?' He replied, 'Why am I to suppose that the vendor and the now owner of the £1000 will *himself* not expend the money in that or some other equally useful manner?' The objection, of course, to this argument is that even if the vendor did, in fact, dispose in a laudable manner of the money, neither the purchaser nor anybody else has a moral right to pass off his responsibilities on to another, *i.e.*, unless he has some moral reason for doing so."

Another Socialist—"All this individual enterprise and private ownership which you, Son Wiseman, and people like you are so fond of upholding, ends in the establishment of a permanent class which permanently possesses, and another class which does not possess—or, I suppose I must say, which possesses less. A permanent class is a permanent injustice, it being monstrous that one set of people should be for ever delivered from the evil of wage-earning and live a life of peace and ease, while another set are equally for ever doomed to the opposite."

Son Wiseman—"The notion that all people who are not wage-earners live a life of peace and ease, and that the wage-earner is necessarily worse off and his condition an 'evil,' is too absurd to merit discussion."

"As to the permanent possessing class, with the exception of a few old-world landowners, whose property descends without partition from eldest son to eldest son, the 'permanence' belongs merely to the class and its social heredity, but in no wise to the individuals or families composing the class. It is in this sense that we can speak of mechanics or shopkeepers as a 'class.' Again, the character or Social Heredity of a class is permanent. A family of the wage-earning class entering, we will say, the upper middle class will be very quickly transformed by the traditions, customs, moral and intellectual outlook, instruction, and example, in short, by the Social Heredity of

good artists are doing well. But though a rich man will pay a very much higher price for these pictures than was ever paid for the others, yet, *ceteris paribus*, a clever drawing consumes no more labour and materials than a stupid one.

"The defence of all expenditure on luxury lies, in the first place, in the fact that the right of a person to *spend* money on what he wants is involved in his right to make money, *i.e.* (and this is the second point), nobody would be tempted to make and to save money, beyond providing for the necessities of existence, unless he was at liberty to spend it—not as some one else dictated, but as he himself desired. Prospective luxury is, therefore, an incentive to people to work well and to save money. When the State encourages investing and protects the investor (whether he invests direct or through Societies and Insurance Companies), people who make and save will tend to invest their savings, and to spend on luxuries—not their savings—but merely the interest on them. Saving and investing is thus encouraged and luxury reduced to a minimum. The encouragement of the *Family* also is a check on luxury. First, the man with a family will have to spend more on necessities; secondly, because such a man will desire to leave a capital sum, be that large or small, for his children, and will therefore save and invest, or insure.

"Always, however, must it be remembered, especially in times of National financial stress, that while our money (if we have been honest and just) is our own as against any enforceable claims or demands on the part of our neighbours, yet we are nevertheless personally and individually responsible *morally*, if we are Christians or accept Christian morals, for the manner in which we use our superfluous wealth, whether that be great or small. I was speaking recently to a certain citizen of this our State who had just spent £1000 on an antique statue (there was here obviously no question of consumption), and I said: 'Would it not have been better, instead of this, to have given the money

certain piece of land will, at some not distant date, be wanted for building or docks or what not, to buy that land, and, if his conjecture prove correct, without himself doing anything to it, find it go up ten or twenty times in value. The people who now want to use the land will have to pay the owner a very great price to buy the land, or they will have to pay a proportionately big rent to lease it. Of course, it is true that other things than Land may go up in value without the owner himself taking any great active part. Thus a person may take shares in an undertaking, and they may increase enormously in value. But there is a difference. The undertaking actually owes its existence to the people who risk their capital in it, whereas the land of the landowner does not owe its existence to the land speculator, nor does it necessarily owe any improvement or development to him. In the case of the shares and the shareholders, the rise in the value of the shares is due, first to the fact that the shareholders have perceived a public need and have undertaken the risk of providing for it; and, secondly, to the fact that they have been able to meet that need in a successful manner—a very difficult matter. The success of the shareholders, when such success exists, is due to their corporate wisdom in their choice of an undertaking, and in their selection and appointment of suitable men to transact the affairs of the Company, and to their own courage, foresight and ability to approach with intelligence and knowledge the ideals and the claims of their employees. In short, the shareholder provides the Nation with goods or conveniences, and the more successfully he does so the better for the public, and the more the shares will go up. The speculator in land, on the contrary, cannot be said to provide the Nation with *land*, he only provides it with documents, entitling certain persons to use the land if they will pay him a fine in the form of purchase money or rent.

Such is the argument of the Land Reformers.

his adopted class. But the particular *families* at any time constituting the middle and upper classes are by no means permanently established in those classes. The risks of commercial life and the repeated division of the original capital among numbers of children, daily bring families back to the class from which they came ; while abilities and virtues of an economic value are perpetually placing in the middle and upper class families who were previously either wage-earners or very small tradesmen

“ The defence of classes lies in the fact that they are a natural outcome of Liberty, that they are an incentive to endeavour, a source of union between the individuals who respectively compose them, and a source of intellectual artistic and social variety and progress.”

Thus discussion here closed , and here we will leave the patient Wiseman and his critics, and conclude with one or two general considerations.

CONCLUSION

It is asserted nowadays by many that people should not be allowed to own land, and consequently we hear much of Land Nationalization and its advantages. The argument is as follows : It is contended that a distinction must be drawn between Land and other forms of Wealth. Other things can be made and legitimately owned by individuals, but not so Land. So far as a man has invested labour or capital in the *development* of Land or in the purchase of such developments, so far is he entitled to the proceeds of such labour or capital But, it is argued, it is surely unjust that because A owns a part of the Earth's surface he should be able to exact a fine or rent from B merely because B desires to live or labour or spend capital on the part of the surface of our common Earth which A has monopolized Thus it is possible for some speculative person who has reason to believe that a

from the private incomes of other people, whether these be derived from land or capital. All these present gains would cease under a communistic system. It is an error to suppose that private incomes are all dissipated in wasteful consumption, in a kind of expenditure, that is, from which the rest of us get no good. In the case of land, for instance, much of the income is in a variety of ways returned direct to the land. Especially is this the case on agricultural estates. But in the case of incomes in general, whether derived from land or not, a large amount is saved and invested in productive industry, thereby increasing employment, increasing also commodities, and so reducing prices. While it is regrettable that wage-earners, even when in a position easily to do so, largely neglect to save, yet it must be admitted that professional men save and build up a small capital, and tradesmen and manufacturers save a considerable part of their income, constantly investing it in the enlargement and improvement of their own plant. Many invest in productive industries indirectly through Insurance Companies, so as to guard against death, old age or sickness. All such investing increases, of course, both employment and commodities. An incredible amount of private income, moreover, is given away. Leave on one side the immense amount that is given away unregistered, there remain all the voluntarily supported churches, schools, hospitals, charitable agencies for all classes, etc etc. Then there are also innumerable endowments given by private people, which are private property, and on which our Universities and many of our Churches, especially those in poorer districts, largely depend.

Agam : A large amount of private property finds its way into the coffers of the State in the form of rates and many and heavy taxes—some annual, some at death. The very names and existence of many of these taxes are unknown to numbers of the wage-earners ; but under a communistic system these latter will have to pay the

From an abstract or academically economic point of view there is undoubtedly much to be said for this argument of the Land Reformers. But there are factors other than economic to be considered. Supposing, for instance, that in the past history of this Country all Land had always (not only in theory, but in daily and hourly practice) effectively belonged to, and been directly leased from, the Crown,—what, we may ask, would have been the history of our political liberties? Again, at the present day there are surely many thoughtful people who, on political grounds rather than economic, view with the gravest misgivings any proposal that the State should become not only a landlord, but the sole one, to the exclusion of all competition and all counteracting influences.

Secondly: it must be remembered that the people who have bought land, did so with the full knowledge and approval of the State. Acting in all good faith, they put savings which they had made or inherited into the purchase of land. All sorts of Institutions, religious, charitable, educational and commercial (as, *e g.*, Insurance Companies), have also bought land or had it bequeathed to them; so that the number of people who at any moment have an interest in the private ownership of land is very much greater than the number of direct landowners, vast even as is the number of these latter.

In the event of Nationalization it is difficult to see how we could escape the moral obligation of compensating these people and Institutions (Appendix D)

* * * * *

In estimating the material gains that this or that economic revolution will give us, we must be on our guard against unconsciously counting our money twice over. This is a general consideration, and applies not only to the Nationalization of land, but also to the proposed Nationalization of Industry.

Every member of the public gets immense advantages

The logical Socialist socializes everything (i.e., makes everything contingent upon the will of the dominating section), including Freedom of Speech. The action of the Bolsheviks in Russia affords abundant evidence of this. The moment they had the power to do so, they denied the moral character of this Liberty or Right, and prostituted the Law for the purpose of coercing in their own interest the whole Press of the Country. Certain of our own Socialists recently attempted to persuade printers to refuse to print facts or arguments which conflicted with any of the demands or ambitions of any of the Trade Unions.

Not only, however, will men be deprived of the Freedom of public Speech and of the Freedom of the Press, but they will be deprived of all Liberty regarding work and domicile. Under our free political system, what kind of work a man will do; when, how and under what conditions he will do it; the locality in which, and the period of his life for which he will work, are determined in part by a regulated competition (in which he can engage either more or less strenuously as he chooses), and to a still greater degree by his own free will and judgment. But under a communistic and therefore non-competitive system it is surely evident that this state of things could not continue. The State, and not the citizen, would have to decide these issues.

Again, the present various natural personal motives for work and efficiency would be wholly lacking, and their place as incentives would be taken by fear—fear, that is, of the penalties of coercive Law, or, in plain English, dread of the lash and the jail. Some Socialists get out of this difficulty by assuming that men in the future will all be saints (or what the Communists would regard as such), and that therefore the penalties of the Law, while they would indeed exist, would never need to be enforced. It can only be replied that one can prophesy success for

equivalent of these taxes themselves, either in cash or in conscripted labour.

In the same way in a communistic State, the manual worker would be compelled, through taxation or conscripted labour, to provide all the capital now provided voluntarily by the exceptional energy, intelligence and self-discipline of private people ; and to provide also out of his own pocket all that he now receives through endowments and private subscription. He will have to provide these things himself, or go without.

It is clear, therefore, that under no communistic system, even if it could be made as economically productive as our system of private ownership, should we have as individuals *all that we already have*, plus the rent, capital and income which is now privately owned. We should have to learn a lesson in subtraction.

* * * * *

One more consideration. While at first sight Communism seems only to attack our Right to own private property, *i e*, our liberty to make, to keep and to contract, in reality it attacks all Liberty. Consider first Freedom of Speech and the Freedom of the Press

If there is to be no private property, the State and its delegated Bodies must own and, therefore, completely control, the whole Press of the Country ; not only the journalistic Press, but all publishing and printing of any sort. They must also own all places of public meeting, indoors and out of doors. It is surely impossible that any one who knows the world in the least degree, or has ever opened a history book, should fail to realize that the Government or dominating political section of the people (be it of what nation you will) would certainly use that power in its own interest, to render mute all serious opposition, to promulgate falsehood, to suppress the truth, and to paralyse all those persons who might otherwise expose them, or whom they might find inconvenient.

Liberty, must, if we would avoid the moral and physical horrors of Absolutism (such as the Bolshevik horrors in Russia), and other horrors here and elsewhere in the past, be our guide, inspiration and goal in all matters of governance, and indeed in all matters Governmental or not, where it is proposed by Man to use force against Man.

Failing this there is no alternative but to seek our political Reforms on the dark trackless sea of Speculation—Speculation reckless, godless, guideless, libertine; only rendered the madder and more forlorn by the exigencies of political parties and the ambitions of cunning men.

We must, however, whatever may be our political ideals, never allow ourselves in our enthusiasm to forget that, even when it takes a course which we do not approve, and which we have used knowledge and argument to prevent, our duty is loyalty to our Nation's State, that historic State which is the Nation's earthly Hope and Strength. We must be faithful to any constitutional act of that State,—unless, indeed, such act is outrageously immoral. Thus we must not countenance, in the sense of trying to make them succeed, such things as the re-establishment of slavery,—desired at this moment by various species of militarist and Socialist absolutists, especially in Germany. Nor must we encourage such Absolutism as, *e.g.*, the murder of weak or "surplus" children, or of "useless" men or women; nor of the murder or persecution of peaceable people because they differ from those in power; nor of the communizing of Woman, nor of the destruction of the Family, or of Religion, or of religious freedom. All of these things, and many others as bad, are finding supporters to-day among Militarists, absolutist Socialists and Bolsheviks.

Given, however, that the State action to which we may object is not outrageously immoral (as in this sane Country it probably would not be), then if it succeeds well and good; if it fails after every one has admittedly tried to make it

any system of government however absurd, if one postulates a population absolutely suited to that form of government. It is a common failing of doctrinaire reformers covertly to postulate the particular human nature suited to their reforms ; and it is often only through misery and bloodshed that they learn to respect the actual and real human nature, and for the future to take it, and all that truly belongs to it, for their guide.

Lastly : Not only will the individual be unable to choose his domicile and its locality, but he will not have the right or liberty to make of his domicile a family abode—a “ home ” in the ordinary British sense. It is not pretended by Socialists or Bolsheviks that the Family in the Christian and civilized sense conduces to the realization of their ideals ; and, in fact, their best known and most logical writers are intensely opposed to the Christian Home ; and already we see that the Bolsheviks in Russia have been strong enough to attempt action in this matter. It is true that among the less consistent and more illogical Communists (the men, that is, who are better than their creed), we find many people who themselves approve of the Family ; but this is in spite of their Socialism rather than because of it. It is impossible to suppose that people who do not believe in the Rights of Men would, if they had the power, hesitate to use force against any social development, the Family or other, or any religious institution or creed, which they considered was not conducive to the furtherance of their political views and interests.

* * * * *

However much the reader may differ from these views upon the subject of wealth, let him remember that the substantive fact of Human Personality, with its corollary of Right, is the matter which—especially at this moment—is of supreme importance. The spiritual nature of Man, the fact of the sanctity and absolute and eternal worth of each individual Person, and of his consequent Right or

APPENDICES

A

We who have hitherto led Europe and the world in general in civic matters of all kinds, are now (as regards a certain section of our countrymen) led and dictated to by foreigners, with Englishmen as their conscious—or more generally unconscious—agents or tools. We are now plagued by such foreign terms as “Soviet,” “Bourgeoisie,” “Bolshevik,” etc. There are wage-earning families among us who are getting (and still more families who *could* be getting) respectively anything from £10 to £30 a week (in addition to modern State-provided facilities and conveniences), and who could easily have investments or insurances if they chose, who now, under the influence of foreigners, and with some utterly absurd associations with the period of the French Revolution and its bullied, starving wage-earners, call themselves the “proletariat”! Also we are all supposed now to go about in foreign fashion, calling each other “comrade.” There is more fellow-feeling in England than in any other country, as the War, to take one instance only, has shown us. But just because we are comrades, not in a merely superficial political sense, and from motives of vanity, cliquism, and individual self-interest, but in the deep human and national sense, we do not need to *talk* quite so much about it as do foreigners. It is only the vain, the clique-lovers, the self-centred and the insincere, who are always jabbering about their sincerity, and protesting to each other in back-scratching style (with such gushing terms as “brother,” “comrade,” etc.) their admiration and friendship.

B

Thus a modern engine-driver might find that he obtained no rise in wage as a result of some improvement in the loco-

succeed, its weaknesses will be recognized as essential, and its total or partial failure will be attributed, not to the hostility of a political party, but to inherent weaknesses and imperfections. That way lie repentance and reform.

* * * * *

Single-headed, few-headed and many-headed tyrants have all been tried, and we are discovering that when things do not work as they ought, it is not the number or even the class of heads that is wrong, but the Despotism that is in the heads. History, especially the most recent, shows that Despotism or Absolutism cannot be outwitted and put to flight by altering Governments. It is ourselves that we must alter, rending our hearts and not our Governments, and learning at last with joy the lesson of Human Personality and of the Divine Right of every spirit of Man,—that Divine Right upon which rests the Divine Right of the State, *i e*, the State's moral Right to rule. At once controlled and urged on by this our transcendental belief, we shall determine that henceforth, and as far as it may be achieved, Force shall minister to Freedom, and Law to Liberty.

WIND BEFORE THE DAWN

So when the world is asleep, and there seems no hope of her waking
Out of some long, bad dream that makes her mutter and moan,
Suddenly, all men arise to the noise of fetters breaking,
And every one smiles at his neighbour and tells him his soul is his
own

(From the *History of England*, by RUDYARD KIPLING and
C. R. L. FLETCHER)

very great and pressing personal reasons for so doing, and also that Government management is so weakened by indifference on the one hand, and by non-economic considerations (such as electioneering, popularity-hunting) upon the other, that in no case can any Government, Local or Central, stand up against any competition from privately owned concerns. This is evidenced by the fact that to a Government which is preparing to embark upon a business, a statutory Monopoly is a prime necessity, and is invariably the first thing insisted upon

Much of the objection to State trading would disappear if the State would trade in competition with, and on the same terms and in the same manner as, private citizens. The State should, if a business is not financially successful in their hands, close it down, as is done in ordinary business, and not buttress it up from taxation, or from the profits of some other State undertaking which may have succeeded. The L.C.C. was accused at one time of this latter proceeding

D

It is proposed, however, at the present time that not only land, but a great variety of industries, should be taken over by the State, and the persons interested in each of these industries are being pacified by promises of compensation. Seeing, however, that in this country it is these same persons who pay the main part of the taxes, we shall find that industry A is to be compensated by industries B, C and D, that B is to be compensated by C, D and A, that C is to be compensated by A, B and D, and so on. In the end the persons represented by A, B, C and D remain as they were, only minus their industries. The proceeding of people who try to live "by taking in each other's washing," is not more deceptive and futile than is this process of mutual compensation. Unless, therefore, we very much broaden the basis of taxation, the difficulty of really compensating injured individuals or corporations will be insuperable.

motives used by his Railway Company. But all wage-earners use the train daily, in the sense that daily, by its means, goods are brought almost to their doors. Anything that, in the end, cheapens transit (as we see also and notably in the case of steamships) cheapens the wage-earners' goods. In this indirect advantage the engine-driver in question shares along with the rest of the public. But he also shares in improvements made in numberless industries for which he himself does not work at all. Consider, in a modern well-kept cottage, to take one instance only, the hundred of different kinds of things required by the modern workman, *e.g.*, furniture, carpets, hangings, wall papers, utensils, ornaments, china and glass, window glazing, paint, grates, matches, coal, gas, sugar, cotton, tobacco, etc. etc., and ask yourself how many of those things the workman could have had, and at what price he could have had them, in the year 1500 or even 1700.¹ Again, how far, how safely and how quickly could he have travelled in those days for one penny? It is evident that, without touching at all on improvements in food supply, the wage-earning class has, contrary to certain recent Socialistic utterances, benefited by industrial progress.

C

In defence of State ownership, it is contended that competition in certain large concerns does not exist any more, and that these things are, therefore, now in the nature of monopolies, and that, in the interest of the public, monopolies must be handed over to the State. There are, however, no incontrovertible figures to prove that Governments manage monopolies more to the public benefit than do private owners. All that is known is that Government officials have no special interest in making the businesses they manage to be of the highest popular utility, whereas private owners have obviously

¹ We are now being told how cheap things were in the Middle Ages, notably in the thirteenth century. Thus a pair of boots (hand made, of course) only cost 4d. But what a poor wage the labourer must have had! Where prices are very low, wages and all incomes tend to be very low also.

A SELECTION FROM MESSRS. METHUEN'S PUBLICATIONS

This Catalogue contains only a selection of the more important books published by Messrs. Methuen. A complete catalogue of their publications may be obtained on application

Bain (R. W.)—

A DIGIT OF THE MOON. A Hindoo Love Story. THE DESCENT OF THE SON. A Cycle of Birth. A HEIFER OF THE DAWN IN THE GREAT GOD'S HAIR. A DRAUGHT OF THE BLUE. AN ESSENCE OF THE DUSK. AN INCARNATION OF THE SNOW. A MINE OF FAULTS. THE ASHES OF A GOD. BUBBLES OF THE FOAM. A SYRUP OF THE BEES. THE LIVERY OF EVE. THE SUBSTANCE OF A DREAM. *All Fcap 8vo 5s net*. AN ECHO OF THE SPHERES. *Wide Demy 12s 6d net.*

Balfour (Graham). THE LIFE OF ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. *Fifteenth Edition. In one Volume. Cr 8vo. Buckram, 7s 6d net.*

Belloe (H.)—

PARIS, 8s 6d. *net*. HILLS AND THE SEA, 6s *net*. ON NOTHING AND KINDRED SUBJECTS, 6s *net*. ON EVERYTHING, 6s *net*. ON SOMETHING, 6s *net*. FIRST AND LAST, 6s *net*. THIS AND THAT AND THE OTHER, 6s *net*. MARIE ANTOINETTE, 18s *net*. THE PYRENEES, 10s 6d *net*.

Blossfontein (Bishop of). ARA CCELI. AN ESSAY IN MYSTICAL THEOLOGY. *Seventh Edition. Cr 8vo 5s net.*

FAITH AND EXPERIENCE. *Third Edition. Cr 8vo 5s net.*

THE CULT OF THE PASSING MOMENT. *Fourth Edition. Cr 8vo 5s net.*

THE ENGLISH CHURCH AND RE-UNION. *Cr 8vo 5s net.*

SCALA MUNDI. *Cr 8vo 4s 6d net.*

Chesterton (G. K.)—

THE BALLAD OF THE WHITE HORSE. ALL THINGS CONSIDERED. TREMENDOUS TRIFLES. ALARMS AND DISCURSIONS. A MISCELLANY OF MEN. *All Fcap 8vo 6s net*. WINE, WATER, AND SONG. *Fcap 8vo 1s 6d net*. THE USES OF DIVERSITY. *6s net.*

Clutton-Brock (A.). WHAT IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN? *Fourth Edition. Fcap 8vo 5s net.*

ESSAYS ON ART. *Second Edition. Fcap 8vo 5s net.*

ESSAYS ON BOOKS. *Fcap 8vo 6s net.* MORE ESSAYS ON BOOKS. *Fcap 8vo 6s net.*

Cole (G. D. H.). SOCIAL THEORY. *Cr 8vo 5s net.*

Conrad (Joseph). THE MIRROR OF THE SEA. Memories and Impressions. *Fourth Edition. Fcap 8vo 6s net.*

Einstein (A.). RELATIVITY. THE SPECIAL AND THE GENERAL THEORY. Translated by ROBERT W. LAWSON. *Third Edition. Cr 8vo 5s net.*

Elliot (T. S.). THE SACRED WOOD. ESSAYS ON POETRY. *Fcap 8vo 6s net.*

Fyleman (Rose.). FAIRIES AND CHIMNEYS. *Fcap 8vo Eighth Edition. 3s 6d net.*

THE FAIRY GREEN. *Third Edition. Fcap 8vo 3s 6d net.*

Gibbins (H. de B.). INDUSTRY IN ENGLAND. HISTORICAL OUTLINES. With Maps and Plans. *Tenth Edition. Demy 8vo 12s 6d net.*

THE INDUSTRIAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND. With 5 Maps and a Plan. *Twenty-seventh Edition. Cr 8vo 5s.*

Gibbon (Edward). THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. Edited, with Notes, Appendices, and Maps, by J. B. BURY. Illustrated. *Seven Volumes. Demy 8vo. Illustrated. Each 12s 6d net. Also in Seven Volumes. Cr 8vo. Each 7s 6d net.*

Glover (T. R.). THE CONFLICT OF RELIGIONS IN THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE. *Ninth Edition. Demy 8vo 10s 6d net.*

POETS AND PURITANS. *Second Edition. Demy 8vo 10s 6d net.*

FROM PERICLES TO PHILIP. *Third Edition. Demy 8vo 10s 6d net.*

VIRGIL. *Fourth Edition. Demy 8vo 10s 6d net.*

THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION AND ITS VERIFICATION. (The Angus Lecture for 1912.) *Second Edition. Cr 8vo 6s net.*

Grahame (Kenneth). THE WIND IN THE WILLOWS. *Eleventh Edition. Cr 8vo 7s 6d net.*

Hall (H. R.). THE ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE NEAR EAST FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE BATTLE OF SALAMIS. Illustrated. *Fifth Edition. Demy 8vo 21s net.*

Hawthorne (Nathaniel). THE SCARLET LETTER. With 31 Illustrations in Colour by HUGH THOMSON. *Wide Royal 8vo, 31s 6d net.*

**PRINTED BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED
EDINBURGH**

McDougall (William). AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
Sixteenth Edition Cr 8vo 8s net

BODY AND MIND A HISTORY AND A DEFENCE OF ANIMISM *Fifth Edition Demy 8vo 12s 6d net*

Maeterlinck (Maurice).—

THE BLUE BIRD A Fairy Play in Six Acts, 6s net
MARY MAGDALENE, A Play in Three Acts, 5s net
DEATH, 3s 6d net
OUR ETERNITY, 6s net
THE UNKNOWN GUEST, 6s net
POEMS, 5s net
THE WRACK OF THE STORM, 6s net
THE MIRACLE OF ST ANTHONY A Play in One Act, 3s 6d net
THE BURGOMASTER OF STILENDE A Play in Three Acts, 5s net
THE BETROTHAL, or, The Blue Bird Chooses, 6s net
MOUNTAIN PATHS, 6s net
THE STORY OF TYLTYL, 21s net.

Milne (A. A.). THE DAY'S PLAY THE HOLIDAY ROUND ONCE A WEEK. All Cr 8vo 7s net
NOT THAT IT MATTERS *Fcap 8vo 6s net*
IF I MAY *Fcap 8vo 6s net*

Oxenham (John).—

BEES IN AMBER, A Little Book of Thoughtful Verse
ALLS WELL A Collection of War Poems
THE KING'S HIGH WAY THE VISION SPLENDID
THE FIERY CROSS HIGH ALTARS
The Record of a Visit to the Battlefields of France and Flanders.
HEARTS COURAGEOUS. ALL CLEAR! WINDS OF THE DAWN
All Small Poets 8vo Paper, 1s 3d net, cloth boards, 2s net
GENTLEMEN—THE KING, 2s net

Petrie (W. M. Flinders). A HISTORY OF EGYPT Illustrated Six Volumes Cr 8vo Each 9s net

VOL. I FROM THE 1ST TO THE XVIITH DYNASTY *Ninth Edition (10s 6d net)*

VOL. II THE XVIITH AND XVIIITH DYNASTIES *Sixth Edition*

VOL. III XIXTH TO XXXTH DYNASTIES *Second Edition*

VOL. IV EGYPT UNDER THE PTOLEMAIC DYNASTY J P MAHAFFY *Second Edition*

VOL. V EGYPT UNDER ROMAN RULE. J G. MILNE. *Second Edition*

VOL. VI EGYPT IN THE MIDDLE AGES. STANLEY LANE POOLE. *Second Edition*

SYRIA AND EGYPT, FROM THE TELL EL AMARNA LETTERS Cr 8vo 5s net

EGYPTIAN TALES Translated from the Papyri First Series, xvth to xiiith Dynasty Illustrated. *Third Edition Cr 8vo 5s net*

EGYPTIAN TALES Translated from the Papyri. Second Series, xviiith to xixth Dynasty Illustrated *Second Edition Cr 8vo 5s net*

Pollard (A. F.) A SHORT HISTORY OF THE GREAT WAR With 19 Maps *Second Edition Cr 8vo 10s 6d net*

Price (L. L.) A SHORT HISTORY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY IN ENGLAND FROM ADAM SMITH TO ARNOLD TOYNBEE *Tenth Edition Cr 8vo. 5s net*

Reid (G. Archdall). THE LAWS OF HEREDITY *Second Edition. Demy 8vo 6s 1s net*

Robertson (G. Grant). SELECT STATUTES, CASES, AND DOCUMENTS, 1660-1832 *Third Edition Demy 8vo 15s net*

Selous (Edmund) TOMMY SMITH'S ANIMALS Illustrated *Nineteenth Edition. Fcap 8vo. 3s 6d net*

TOMMY SMITH'S OTHER ANIMALS Illustrated *Eleventh Edition Fcap 8vo 3s 6d net*

TOMMY SMITH AT THE ZOO Illustrated *Fourth Edition Fcap 8vo 2s 9d*

TOMMY SMITH AGAIN AT THE ZOO Illustrated *Second Edition Fcap 8vo 2s 9d*

JACK'S INSECTS *Popular Edition Cr 8vo 3s 6d*

JACK'S OTHER INSECTS Cr 8vo 3s 6d

Shelley (Percy Bysshe). POEMS With an Introduction by A CLUTTON BROCK and Notes by C D LOCOCK Two Volumes *Demy 8vo 6s 1s net*

Smith (Adam) THE WEALTH OF NATIONS Edited by EDWIN CANNAN Two Volumes *Second Edition Demy 8vo 6s 1s net*

Stevenson (R. L.). THE LETTERS OF ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON Edited by Sir SIDNEY COLVIN A New Rearranged Edition in four volumes *Fourth Edition. Fcap 8vo Each 6s net*

Surtees (R. B.). HANDLEY CROSS Illustrated *Ninth Edition Fcap 8vo 7s 6d net*

MR. SPONGE'S SPORTING TOUR Illustrated *Fifth Edition Fcap 8vo. 7s 6d net*

ASK MAMMA OR, THE RICHEST COMMONER IN ENGLAND Illustrated. *Second Edition Fcap 8vo 7s 6d net*

JORROCK'S JAUNTS AND JOLLITIES Illustrated *Seventh Edition Fcap 8vo 6s net*

MR. FACEY ROMFORD'S HOUNDS Illustrated *Fourth Edition Fcap 8vo 7s 6d net*

HAWBUCK GRANGE, or, THE SPORTING ADVENTURES OF THOMAS SCOTT, Esq Illustrated. *Fcap 8vo 6s net*

PLAIN OR RINGLETS? Illustrated *Fcap 8vo 7s 6d net*

HILLINGDON HALL With 12 Coloured Plates by WILBRAKE, HEATH, and JELLI COZ. *Fcap 8vo 7s 6d net*

- Holdsworth (W. S.). A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LAW.** Vols I, II, III. Each Second Edition Demy 8vo Each 15s net
- Inge (W R.). CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM** (The Bampton Lectures of 1899) Fourth Edition Cr. 8vo 7s 6d net
- Jenks (E.). AN OUTLINE OF ENGLISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT** Fourth Edition Revised by R C K. ENSOR Cr 8vo. 5s net
- A SHORT HISTORY OF ENGLISH LAW FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE END OF THE YEAR 1911** Second Edition, revised Demy 8vo 12s 6d net.
- Julian (Lady) of Norwich. REVELATIONS OF DIVINE LOVE** Edited by GRACE WARRACK Seventh Edition Cr. 8vo 5s net
- Keats (John). POEMS.** Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by E DE SELINCOURT With a Frontispiece in Photogravure Fourth Edition Demy 8vo. 12s 6d net
- Kidd (Benjamin) THE SCIENCE OF POWER** Ninth Edition Crown 8vo 7s 6d net
- SOCIAL EVOLUTION.** Demy 8vo 8s 6d net.
- Kipling (Rudyard) BARRACK-ROOM BALLADS** 20th Thousand Cr 8vo Buckram, 7s 6d net; Also Fcap. 8vo Cloth, 6s net, leather, 7s 6d net Also a Service Edition Two Volumes Square fcap 8vo Each 3s net
- THE SEVEN SEAS** 157th Thousand Cr 8vo. Buckram, 7s 6d net Also Fcap 8vo Cloth, 6s net, leather, 7s 6d net. Also a Service Edition Two Volumes. Square fcap 8vo. Each 3s net
- THE FIVE NATIONS** 126th Thousand Cr 8vo. Buckram, 7s 6d net Also Fcap 8vo Cloth, 6s net; leather, 7s 6d net Also a Service Edition Two Volumes. Square fcap 8vo Each 3s net
- DEPARTMENTAL DITTIES** 94th Thousand. Cr 8vo Buckram, 7s 6d net Also Fcap 8vo. Cloth, 6s net; leather, 7s 6d net Also a Service Edition Two Volumes Square fcap 8vo Each 3s net
- THE YEARS BETWEEN** Cr 8vo Buckram, 7s. 6d net Also on thin paper Fcap 8vo Blue cloth, 6s net, Lamp lambskin, 7s. 6d net Also a Service Edition Two Volumes Square fcap 8vo Each 3s net
- HYMN BEFORE ACTION.** Illuminated. Fcap 4to, 1s 6d net.
- RECESSIONAL** Illuminated Fcap 4to 1s 6d. net
- TWENTY POEMS FROM RUDYARD KIPLING** 360th Thousand Fcap 8vo 1s net
- Lamb (Charles and Mary). THE COMPLETE WORKS** Edited by E V LUCAS A New and Revised Edition in Six Volumes. With Frontispieces Fcap. 8vo Each 6s net The volumes are—
I MISCELLANEOUS PROSE. II ELIA AND THE LAST ESSAY OF ELIA III. BOOKS FOR CHILDREN IV PLAYS AND POEMS V and VI LETTERS
THE ESSAYS OF ELIA With an Introduction by E V. LUCAS, and 28 Illustrations by A. GARTH JONES. Fcap 8vo 5s net
Lankester (Sir Ray). SCIENCE FROM AN EASY CHAIR Illustrated Thirteenth Edition Cr 8vo 7s 6d net
MORE SCIENCE FROM AN EASY CHAIR Illustrated Third Edition. Cr 8vo 7s 6d net
DIVERSIONS OF A NATURALIST Illustrated Third Edition Cr 8vo 7s 6d net
SECRETS OF EARTH AND SEA. Cr 8vo 8s 6d net.
Lodge (Sir Oliver). MAN AND THE UNIVERSE. A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE ADVANCE IN SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE UPON OUR UNDERSTANDING OF CHRISTIANITY. Ninth Edition Crown 8vo 7s 6d net
THE SURVIVAL OF MAN. A STUDY IN UNRECOGNISED HUMAN FACULTY Seventh Edition Cr 8vo 7s 6d. net
MODERN PROBLEMS Cr 8vo 7s 6d net.
RAYMOND, OR LIFE AND DEATH Illustrated Twelfth Edition Demy 8vo 15s net
LUCAS (E Y.)
THE LIFE OF CHARLES LAMB, 2 vols, 21s net A WANDERER IN HOLLAND, 10s 6d net A WANDERER IN LONDON, 10s 6d net LONDON REVISITED, 10s 6d net A WANDERER IN PARIS, 10s 6d. net and 6s net A WANDERER IN FLORENCE, 10s 6d net A WANDERER IN VENICE, 10s 6d net THE OPEN ROAD, A Little Book for Wayfarers, 6s 6d net and 7s 6d net THE FRIENDLY TOWN A Little Book for the Urbane, 6s net FIRESIDE AND SUNSHINE, 6s net CHARACTER AND COMEDY, 6s net THE GENTLEST ART A Choice of Letters by Entertaining Hands, 6s 6d net THE SECOND POST, 6s net HER INFINITE VARIETY. A Feminine Portrait Gallery, 6s net GOOD COMPANY A Rally of Men, 6s net. ONE DAY AND ANOTHER, 6s net OLD LAMPS FOR NEW, 6s net LOTTERER'S HARVEST, 6s net CLOUD AND SILVER, 6s net A BOSWELL OF BAGHDAD, AND OTHER ESSAYS, 6s net TWIXT EAGLE AND DOVE, 6s net THE PHANTOM JOURNAL, AND OTHER ESSAYS AND DIVERSIONS, 6s net SPECIALLY SELECTED. A Choice of Essays 7s 6d net THE BRITISH SCHOOL An Anecdotal Guide to the British Painters and Paintings in the National Gallery, 6s net. TRAVEL NOTES

The Arden Shakespeare

General Editor, R H CASE

Demy 8vo. 6s net each volume

An edition of Shakespeare in Single Plays, each edited with a full Introduction, Textual Notes, and a Commentary at the foot of the page.

Classics of Art

Edited by DR J. H. W. LAING

With numerous Illustrations. Wide Royal 8vo

THE ART OF THE GREEKS, 15s net	THE ART OF THE ROMANS, 16s net	CHARDIN, 15s net	DONATELLO, 16s net	GEORGE ROMNEY, 15s net	GHIRLANDAIO, 15s net	LAWRENCE, 25s net	MICHELANGELO, 15s net	net RAPHAEL, 15s net	REMBRANDT'S ETCHINGS, Two Vols, 25s net	TINTORRETTO, 16s net	TITIAN, 16s net	TURNER'S SKETCHES AND DRAWINGS, 15s net	VELAZQUEZ, 15s net.
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------	--------------------	------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	---	----------------------	-----------------	---	---------------------

The 'Complete' Series*Fully Illustrated Demy 8vo*

THE COMPLETE AMATEUR BOXER, 10s 6d net	THE COMPLETE ASSOCIATION FOOTBALLER, 10s 6d net	THE COMPLETE ATHLETIC TRAINER, 10s 6d net	THE COMPLETE BILLIARD PLAYER, 12s 6d net	THE COMPLETE COOK, 10s 6d net	THE COMPLETE CRICKETER, 10s 6d net	THE COMPLETE FOXHUNTER, 16s net	THE COMPLETE GOLFER, 12s 6d net	THE COMPLETE HOCKEY PLAYER, 10s 6d net	THE COMPLETE HORSEMAN, 12s 6d net	net THE COMPLETE JUIITSUAN Cr 8vo 5s net	THE COMPLETE LAWN TENNIS PLAYER, 12s 6d net	THE COMPLETE MOTORIST, 10s 6d net	THE COMPLETE MOUNTAINEER, 16s net	THE COMPLETE OAKSMAN, 15s net	THE COMPLETE PHOTOGRAPHER, 15s net	THE COMPLETE RUGBY FOOTBALLER, ON THE NEW ZEALAND SYSTEM, 12s 6d net	THE COMPLETE SHOT, 16s net	THE COMPLETE SWIMMER, 10s 6d net	THE COMPLETE YACHTSMAN, 16s net
--	---	---	--	-------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------	--	----------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The Connoisseur's Library*With numerous Illustrations. Wide Royal 8vo 25s net each volume*

ENGLISH COLOURED BOOKS	ENGLISH FURNITURE	ETCHINGS	EUROPEAN ENAMELS	FINE BOOKS	GLASS	GOLDSMITHS' AND SILVERSMITHS' WORK	ILLUMINATED	MANUSCRIPTS	IVORIES	JEWELLERY	MEZZOTINTS	MINIATURES	PORCELAIN	SEALS	WOOD SCULPTURE
------------------------	-------------------	----------	------------------	------------	-------	------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	---------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------	----------------

Handbooks of Theology*Demy 8vo*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION, 15s net	A HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, 16s net	INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION, 12s 6d net	AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE CREEDS, 12s 6d net	THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA, 12s 6d net	THE XXXIX ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 15s net
--	--	---	--	---	--

Health Series*Fcap 8vo 2s 6d net*

THE BABY	THE CARE OF THE BODY	THE CARE OF THE TEETH	THE EYES OF OUR CHILDREN	HEALTH FOR THE MIDDLE-AGED	THE HEALTH OF A WOMAN	THE HEALTH OF THE SKIN	HOW TO LIVE	LONG	THE PREVENTION OF THE COMMON COLD	STAYING THE PLAGUE	THROAT AND EAR TROUBLES	TUBERCULOSIS	THE HEALTH OF THE CHILD, 2s net
----------	----------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	-------------	------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	--------------	---------------------------------

Tilden (W. T.). THE ART OF LAWN TENNIS. Illustrated *Cr 8vo 6s net*

Tilston (Mary W.) DAILY STRENGTH FOR DAILY NEEDS *Twenty seventh Edition Medium 16mo 3s 6d net*

Underhill (Evelyn). MYSTICISM A Study in the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness *Eighth Edition Demy 8vo 15s net*

Vardon (Harry) HOW TO PLAY GOLF Illustrated *Thirteenth Edition Cr 8vo 5s net*

Waterhouse (Elizabeth). A LITTLE BOOK OF LIFE AND DEATH. *Twentieth Edition Small Pott 8vo Cloth, 2s 6d net*

Wells (J.). A SHORT HISTORY OF ROME *Seventeenth Edition With 3 Maps. Cr 8vo 6s*

Wilde (Oscar). THE WORKS OF OSCAR WILDE *Each 8vo Each 6s 6d net.*

I LORD ARTHUR SAVILE'S CRIME AND THE PORTRAIT OF MR. W. H. II. THE DUCHESS OF PADUA III. POE'S, IV. LADY WINDERMERE'S FAN V. A WOMAN OF NO IMPORTANCE VI. AN IDEAL HUSBAND VII. THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING EARNEST VIII. A HOUSE OF POMEGRANATES IX. INTENTIONS X. DE PROFUNDIS AND PRISON LETTERS XI. ESSAYS XII. SALOMÉ, A FLORENTINE TRAGEDY, and LA SAINTE COURTISANE XIII. A CRITIC IN PALL MALL. XIV. SELECTED PROSE OF OSCAR WILDE. XV. ART AND DECORATION

A HOUSE OF POMEGRANATES Illustrated *Cr 4to 21s net*

Yeats (W B.) A BOOK OF IRISH VERSE *Fourth Edition. Cr 8vo 7s net*

PART II.—A SELECTION OF SERIES

Ancient Cities

General Editor, SIR B. C. A. WINDLE

Cr 8vo 6s. net each volume

With Illustrations by E. H. New, and other Artists

BRISTOL. CANTERBURY CHESTER. DUB- LIN EDINBURGH LINCOLN SHREWSBURY
WELLS and GLASTONBURY

The Antiquary's Books

General Editor, J. CHARLES COX

Demy 8vo. 10s 6d. net each volume

With Numerous Illustrations

ANCIENT PAINTED GLASS IN ENGLAND
ARCHÆOLOGY AND FALSE ANTIQUITIES
THE BELLS OF ENGLAND THE BRASSES
OF ENGLAND THE CASTLE AND WALLED
TOWNS OF ENGLAND CELTIC ART IN
PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN TIMES CHURCH-
WARDENS' ACCOUNTS THE DOMESDAY
INQUEST ENGLISH CHURCH FURNITURE
ENGLISH COSTUME ENGLISH MONASTIC
LIFE ENGLISH SEALS FOLK-LORE AS
AN HISTORICAL SCIENCE THE GILDS AND
COMPANIES OF LONDON THE HERMITS
AND ANCHORITES OF ENGLAND THE

MANOR AND MANORIAL RECORDS THE
MEDIEVAL HOSPITALS OF ENGLAND
OLD ENGLISH INSTRUMENTS OF MUSIC
OLD ENGLISH LIBRARIES OLD SERVICE
BOOKS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH PARISH
LIFE IN MEDIEVAL ENGLAND THE
PARISH REGISTERS OF ENGLAND RE-
MAINS OF THE PREHISTORIC AGE IN ENG-
LAND THE ROMAN ERA IN BRITAIN
ROMANO-BRITISH BUILDINGS AND EARTH-
WORKS THE ROYAL FORESTS OF ENG-
LAND THE SCHOOLS OF MEDIEVAL ENG-
LAND SHRINES OF BRITISH SAINTS.

Sports Series

Illustrated Fcap 8vo

ALL ABOUT FLYING, 3s net GOLF DO'S
AND DON'T'S, 2s net THE GOLFING SWING
2s 6d net HOW TO SWIM, 2s net
LAWN TENNIS, 3s net SKATING, 3s net

CROSS COUNTRY SKIING, 5s net WREST-
LING, 2s net QUICK CUTS TO GOOD GOLF,
2s 6d net HOCKEY, 4s net

The Westminster Commentaries

General Editor, WALTER LOCK

Demy 8vo

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, 16s net
AMOS, 8s 6d net I CORINTHIANS, 8s
6d net EXODUS, 15s net EZEKIEL,
12s 6d net GENESIS, 16s net HEBREWS,
8s 6d net ISAIAH, 16s net JEREMIAH,

16s net JOB, 8s 6d net THE PASTORAL
EPISTLES, 8s 6d net THE PHILIPPIANS,
8s 6d net ST JAMES, 8s 6d net ST
MATTHEW, 15s net

Methuen's Two-Shilling Library

Cheap Editions of many Popular Books

Fcap 8vo

PART III.—A SELECTION OF WORKS OF FICTION

Bennett (Arnold).—

CLAYHANGER, 8s net HILDA LESSWAYS,
8s 6d net THESE TWAIN THE CARD
THE REGENT A FIVE TOWNS STORY OF
ADVENTURE IN LONDON THE PRICE OF
LOVE BURIED ALIVE A MAN FROM THE
NORTH THE MATADOR OF THE FIVE
TOWNS WHOM GOD HATH JOINED A
GREAT MAN A Frolic. All 7s 6d net

Birmingham (George A.).—

SPANISH GOLD THE SEARCH PARTY
LALAGE'S LOVERS. THE BAD TIMES UP,
THE REBELS All 7s 6d net INISHEENY,
8s 6d net

Burroughs (Edgar Rice).—

TARZAN OF THE APES, 6s net THE
RETURN OF TARZAN, 6s net THE BEASTS
OF TARZAN, 6s net THE SON OF TARZAN,
6s net JUNGLE TALES OF TARZAN, 6s
net TARZAN AND THE JEWELS OF OPAR,
6s net TARZAN THE UNTAMED, 7s 6d net
A PRINCESS OF MARS, 6s net THE GODS
OF MARS, 6s net THE WARLORD OF
MARS, 6s net

Conrad (Joseph). A SET OF SIX, 7s 6d net
VICTORY AN ISLAND TALE Cr 8vo 9s
net THE SECRET AGENT A Simple Tale
Cr 8vo 9s net UNDER WESTERN EYES
Cr 8vo 9s net CHANCE Cr 8vo 9s
net

Corelli (Marie).—

A ROMANCE OF TWO WORLDS, 7s 6d net
VENDETTA OF, THE STORY OF ONE FOR-
GOTTEN, 8s net THELMA. A Norwegian
Princess, 8s 6d net ARDATH THE STORY
OF A DEAD SELF, 7s 6d net. THE SOUL OF
LILITH, 7s 6d net WORMWOOD A Drama
of Paris, 8s net BARABBAS A Dream of
the World's Tragedy, 8s net. THE SORROWS
OF SATAN, 7s 6d net THE MASTER-
CHRISTIAN, 8s 6d net TEMPORAL POWER
A Study in Supremacy, 6s net GOD'S
GOOD MAN A Simple Love Story, 8s 6d
net HOLY ORDERS THE Tragedy of a
Quiet Life, 8s 6d net THE MIGHTY ATOM,
7s 6d net BOY A Sketch, 7s 6d net.
CAMEOS, 6s net THE LIFE EVERLASTING,
8s 6d net THE LOVE OF LONG AGO, AND
OTHER STORIES, 8s 6d net

Doyle (Sir A. Conan). ROUND THE RED
LAMP. Twelfth Edition Cr 8vo 7s 6d.
net

Hichens (Robert).—

TONGUES OF CONSCIENCE, 7s 6d net
FELIX Three Years in a Life, 7s 6d net
THE WOMAN WITH THE FAÇ, 7s 6d net
BYWAYS, 7s 6d net THE GARDEN OF
ALLAH, 8s 6d net THE CALL OF THE
BLOOD, 8s 6d net BARBARY SHEEP, 6s
net THE DWELLERS ON THE THRESHOLD,
7s 6d net THE WAY OF AMBITION, 7s
6d net IN THE WILDERNESS, 7s 6d net

Leaders of Religion

Edited by H. C. BEECHING. *With Portraits*
Crown 8vo 3s. net each volume

The Library of Devotion

Handy Editions of the great Devotional Books, well edited.
With Introductions and (where necessary) Notes
Small Pott 8vo, cloth, 3s. net and 3s. 6d. net

Little Books on Art

With many Illustrations. Demy 16mo. 5s. net each volume

Each volume consists of about 200 pages, and contains from 30 to 40 Illustrations, including a Frontispiece in Photogravure

ALBRECHT DÜRER	THE ARTS OF JAPAN	BOUCHER	HOLBEIN	ILLUMINATED
BOOKPLATES	BOTTICELLI	BURNJONES	MANUSCRIPTS.	JEWELLERY
CELLINI	CHRISTIAN SYMBOLISM.	CHIST	JOHN HOTT	
IN ART	CLAUDE	CONSTABLE.	COROT	
EARLY ENGLISH	WATER COLOUR	ERAN	EL	
NELS	FRÉDÉRIC LEIGHTON	GEORGE		
ROBINRY.	GREEK ART.	GRUPEZ	AND	
				WATTS

The Little Guides

With many Illustrations by E. H. New and other artists, and from photographs
Small Pott 8vo. 4s. net, 5s. net, and 6s. net

Guides to the English and Welsh Counties, and some well-known districts

The main features of these Guides are (1) a handy and charming form; (2) illustrations from photographs and by well-known artists; (3) good plans and maps; (4) an adequate but compact presentation of everything that is interesting in the natural features, history, archaeology, and architecture of the town or district treated.

The Little Quarto Shakespeare

Edited by W. J. CRAIG. With Introductions and Notes
Pott 16mo. 40 Volumes *Leather, price 1s. 9d. net each volume*
Cloth, 1s. 6d.

Plays

Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net

MILESTONES	Arnold Bennett and Edward Knoblock	<i>Ninth Edition</i>	TYPHOON	A Play in Four Acts	Melchior Lengyel
IRFAL HUSBAND, AN	Oscar Wilde	<i>Acting Edition</i>	Irving	English Version by Laurence	<i>Second Edition</i>
KISMET	Edward Knoblock	<i>Fourth Edition.</i>	WARE CASE, THE	George Pleydell	
			GENERAL POST	J E Harold Terry	<i>Second Edition.</i>

Hops (Anthony)—

A CHANGE OF AIR A MAN OF MARK.
THE CHRONICLES OF COUNT ANTONIO
SIMON DALE THE KING'S MIRROR.
QUISANTÉ. THE DOLLY DIALOGUES
TALES OF TWO PEOPLE A SERVANT OF
THE PUBLIC MRS. MAXON PROTESTS
A YOUNG MAN'S YEAR. BEAUMARVOY
HOME FROM THE WARS *All 7s 6d net*

Jacobs (W. W.)—

MANY CARGOES, *5s net* SEA URCHINS,
5s net and *3s 6d net* A MASTER OF
CRAFT, *5s net* LIGHT FREIGHTS, *5s net*
THE SKIPPER'S WOOING, *5s net* AT SUN-
WICH PORT, *5s net* DIALSTONE LANE,
5s net ODD CRAFT, *5s net* THE LADY
OF THE BARGE, *5s net* SALTHAVEN, *5s net*
SAILORS' KNOTS, *5s net* SHORT
CRUISES, *6s net*

London (Jack) WHITE FANG *Ninth Edition Cr 8vo 7s. 6d net.***Lucas (E. V.)—**

LISTENER'S LURE An Oblique Narration,
6s net OVER BEMERTON'S An Easy-
going Chronicle, *6s net* MR INGLESIDE,
6s. net LONDON LAVENDER, *6s net*
LANDMARKS, *7s 6d net* THE VERMILION
BOX, *7s 6d net* VERENA IN THE MIDST,
8s 6d net

McKenna (Stephen)—

SONIA Between Two Worlds, *8s net*
NINETY SIX HOURS' LEAVE, *7s. 6d net*
THE SIXTH SENSE, *6s net.* MIDAS & SON,
8s net

Malet (Lucas)—

THE HISTORY OF SIR RICHARD CALMADY
A Romance. THE CARISSIMA THE
GATELESS BARRIER DEADHAM HARD
All 7s. 6d. net THE WAGES OF SIN *8s net*

Mason (A. E. W.) CLEMENTINA. *Illustrated Ninth Edition Cr 8vo 7s 6d net***Maxwell (W. B.)—**

VIVIAN THE GUARDED FLAME. ODD
LENGTHS. HILL RISE. THE REST CURE
All 7s 6d net

Oxenham (John)—

A WEAVER OF WEBS PROFIT AND LOSS.
THE SONG OF HYACINTH, and Other
Stories LAURISTONS THE COIL OF CARNE
THE QUEST OF THE GOLDEN ROSE. MARY
ALL-ALONE. BROKEN SHACKLES "1914"
All 7s. 6d. net.

Parker (Gilbert)—

PIERRE AND HIS PEOPLE. MRS FALCHION
THE TRANSLATION OF A SAVAGE WHEN
VALMOND CAME TO PONTIAC The Story of
a Lost Napoleon AN ADVENTURER OF THE
NORTH The Last Adventures of 'Pretty
Pierre' THE SEATS OF THE MIGHTY THE
BATTLE OF THE STRONG A Romance
of Two Kingdoms THE POMP OF THE
LAVIETTES. NORTHERN LIGHTS *All 7s 6d net*

Phillipotts (Eden)—

CHILDREN OF THE MIST SONS OF THE
MORNING THE RIVER THE AMERICAN
PRISONER DEMETER'S DAUGHTER. THE
HUMAN BOY AND THE WAR *All 7s 6d net*

Ridge (W. Pett)—

A SON OF THE STATE, *7s 6d net* THE
REWINGTON SENTENCE, *7s 6d net*
MADAME PRINCE, *7s 6d net* TOP SPEED,
7s 6d net SPECIAL PERFORMANCES, *6s net*
THE BUSTLING HOURS, *7s 6d net*

Rohmer (Sax)—

THE DEVIL DOCTOR. THE SEVEN
MYSTERIES. TALES OF SECRET EGYPT
THE ORCHARD OF TEARS THE GOLDEN
SCORPION *All 7s 6d net*

Swinnerton (F.). SHOPS AND HOUSES

Third Edition Cr 8vo 7s. 6d net
SEPTEMBER. *Third Edition Cr 8vo 7s 6d net*

THE HAPPY FAMILY *Second Edition 7s 6d net*

ON THE STAIRCASE *Third Edition 7s 6d net*

Wells (H. G.) BEALBY *Fourth Edition Cr 8vo 7s 6d. net***Williamson (G. H. and A. M.)—**

THE LIGHTNING CONDUCTOR The Strange
Adventures of a Motor Car LADY BETTY
ACROSS THE WATER SCARLET RUNNER
LORD LOVELAND DISCOVERS AMERICA
THE GUESTS OF HERCULES IT HAPPENED
IN EGYPT A SOLDIER OF THE LEGION
THE SHOP GIRL. THE LIGHTNING CON-
DUCTRESS SECRET HISTORY THE LOVE
PIRATE. *All 7s 6d. net.* CRUCIFIX
CORNER. *6s net.*

Methuen's Two-Shilling Novels

Cheap Editions of many of the most Popular Novels of the day

Write for Complete List

Recap. 8vo

Sports Series

Illustrated Fcap 8vo

ALL ABOUT FLYING, 2s net GOLF DO'S
AND DON'T'S, 2s net THE GOLFING SWING
2s 6d net HOW TO SWIM, 2s net
LAWN TENNIS, 3s net SKATING, 3s net

CROSS COUNTRY SKIING, 5s net WREST-
LING, 2s net QUICK CUTS TO GOOD GOLF,
2s 6d net HOCKEY, 4s net

The Westminster Commentaries

General Editor, WALTER LOCK

Demy 8vo

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, 16s net
AMOS, 8s 6d net I CORINTHIANS, 8s
6d net EXODUS, 15s net EZEKIEL,
12s 6d net GENESIS, 16s net HEBREWS,
8s 6d net ISAIAH, 16s net JEREMIAH,

16s. net JOB, 8s 6d net THE PASTORAL
EPISTLES, 8s 6d net THE PHILIPPIANS,
8s 6d. net ST JAMES, 8s 6d net ST
MATTHEW, 15s net

Methuen's Two-Shilling Library

Cheap Editions of many Popular Books

Fcap 8vo

PART III.—A SELECTION OF WORKS OF FICTION

Bennett (Arnold).—

CLAYHANGER, 8s net HILDA LESSWAYS,
8s 6d net THESE TWAIN THE CARD
THE REGENT A FIVE TOWNS Story of
Adventure in London THE PRICE OF
LOVE. BURIED ALIVE. A MAN FROM THE
NORTH THE MATADOR OF THE FIVE
TOWNS WHOM GOD HATH JOINED A
GREAT MAN A Frolic. All 7s 6d net

Birmingham (George A.).—

SPANISH GOLD THE SEARCH PARTY
LALAGE'S LOVERS. THE BAD TIMES UP,
THE REBELS All 7s 6d net INISKEENY,
8s 6d net

Burroughs (Edgar Rice).—

TARZAN OF THE APES, 6s net THE
RETURN OF TARZAN, 6s net THE BEASTS
OF TARZAN, 6s net THE SON OF TARZAN,
6s net JUNGLE TALES OF TARZAN, 6s
net TARZAN AND THE JEWELS OF OPAR,
6s net TARZAN THE UNTAMED, 7s 6d. net
A PRINCESS OF MARS, 6s net THE GODS
OF MARS, 6s net THE WARLORD OF
MARS, 6s net

Conrad (Joseph). A SET OF SIX, 7s 6d net
VICTORY An Island Tale Cr 8vo 9s
net THE SECRET AGENT A Simple Tale
Cr 8vo 9s net UNDER WESTERN EYES.
Cr 8vo 9s net CHANCE Cr 8vo 9s
net

Corelli (Marie).—

A ROMANCE OF TWO WORLDS, 7s 6d net
VENDETTA or, The Story of One For-
gotten, 8s net THELMA. A Norwegian
Princess, 8s 6d net ARDATH The Story
of a Dead Self, 7s 6d. net. THE SOUL OF
LILITH, 7s 6d net WORMWOOD A Drama
of Paris, 8s net BARABBAS A Dream of
the World's Tragedy, 8s net. THE SORROWS
OF SATAN, 7s 6d. net THE MASTER-
CHRISTIAN, 8s 6d. net TEMPORAL POWER
A Study in Supremacy, 6s net GOD'S
GOOD MAN A Simple Love Story, 8s 6d.
net HOLY ORDERS The Tragedy of a
Quiet Life, 8s 6d net THE MIGHTY ATOM,
7s 6d net BOY A Sketch, 7s 6d net.
CAMEOS, 6s net THE LIFE EVERLASTING,
8s 6d net THE LOVE OF LONG AGO, AND
OTHER STORIES, 8s 6d net

Doyle (Sir A. Conan) ROUND THE RED
LAMP. Twelfth Edition Cr 8vo 7s 6d.
net

Hichens (Robert).—

TONGUES OF CONSCIENCE, 7s 6d net
FELIX Three Years in a Life, 7s 6d net
THE WOMAN WITH THE FAN, 7s 6d. net
BYWAYS, 7s 6d net THE GARDEN OF
ALLAN, 8s 6d net THE CALL OF THE
BLOOD, 8s 6d net BARBARY SHEEP, 6s
net THE DWELLERS ON THE THRESHOLD,
7s 6d net THE WAY OF AMBITION, 7s
6d. net IN THE WILDERNESS, 7s 6d. net

Hope (Anthony)—

A CHANGE OF AIR A MAN OF MARK.
THE CHRONICLES OF COUNT ANTONIO
SIMON DALE THE KING'S MIRROR.
QUISANTÉ. THE DOLLY DIALOGUES
TALES OF TWO PEOPLE A SERVANT OF
THE PUBLIC MRS MAXON PROTESTS
A YOUNG MAN'S YEAR. BEAUMARVOY
HOME FROM THE WARS *All 7s 6d net*

Jacobs (W. W.)—

MANY CARGOES, *5s net* SEA URCHINS,
5s net and *3s 6d net* A MASTER OF
CRAFT, *5s net* LIGHT FREIGHTS, *5s net*
THE SKIPPER'S WOOING, *5s net* AT SUN-
WICH PORT, *5s net* DIALSTONE LANE,
5s net ODD CRAFT, *5s net* THE LADY
OF THE BARGE, *5s net* SALTHAVEN, *5s net*
SAILORS' KNOTS, *5s net* SHORT
CRUISES, *6s net*

London (Jack) WHITE FANG *Ninth Edition Cr 8vo 7s. 6d net.***Lucas (E. Y.)—**

LISTENER'S LURE An Oblique Narration,
6s net OVER BEMERTON'S An Easy-
going Chronicle, *6s net* MR INGLESIDE,
6s. net LONDON LAVENDER, *6s net*
LANDMARKS, *7s 6d net* THE VERMILION
BOX, *7s 6d net* VERENA IN THE MIDST,
8s 6d net

McKenna (Stephen)—

SONIA Between Two Worlds, *8s net*
NINETY SIX HOURS' LEAVE, *7s. 6d net*
THE SIXTH SENSE, *6s net.* MIDAS & SON,
8s net

Malet (Lucas)—

THE HISTORY OF SIR RICHARD CALMADY
A Romance. THE CARISSIMA THE
GATELESS BARRIER DEADHAM HARD
All 7s. 6d. net THE WAGES OF SIN *8s net*

Mason (A. E. W.) CLEMENTINA. *Illustrated Ninth Edition Cr 8vo 7s 6d net***Maxwell (W. B.)—**

VIVIEN THE GUARDED FLAME. ODD
LENGTHS. HILL RISE. THE REST CURE
All 7s 6d net

Oxenham (John)—

A WEAVER OF WEBS PROFIT AND LOSS.
THE SONG OF HYACINTH, and Other
Stories LAURISTONS THE COIL OF CARNE
THE QUEST OF THE GOLDEN ROSE. MARY
ALL-ALONE. BROKEN SHACKLES "1914"
All 7s. 6d. net.

Parlker (Gilbert)—

PIERRE AND HIS PEOPLE. MRS FALCHION
THE TRANSLATION OF A SAVAGE WHEN
VALMOND CAME TO PONTIAC The Story of
a Lost Napoleon AN ADVENTURER OF THE
NORTH The Last Adventures of 'Pretty
Pierre' THE SEATS OF THE MIGHTY THE
BATTLE OF THE STRONG A Romance
of Two Kingdoms THE POMP OF THE
LAVILETTES. NORTHERN LIGHTS *All 7s 6d net*

Phillpotts (Eden)—

CHILDREN OF THE MIST SONS OF THE
MORNING THE RIVER THE AMERICAN
PRISONER DEMETER'S DAUGHTER. THE
HUMAN BOY AND THE WAR *All 7s 6d net*

Ridge (W. Pett)—

A SON OF THE STATE, *7s 6d net* THE
REWINGTON SENTENCE, *7s 6d net*
MADAME PRINCE, *7s 6d net* TOP SPEED,
7s 6d net SPECIAL PERFORMANCES, *6s net*
THE BUSTLING HOURS, *7s 6d net*

Rohmer (Sax)—

THE DEVIL DOCTOR. THE SI FAN
MYSTERIES. TALES OF SECRET EGYPT
THE ORCHARD OF TEARS THE GOLDEN
SCORPION *All 7s 6d net*

Swinerton (F.). SHOPS AND HOUSES

Third Edition Cr 8vo 7s. 6d net

SEPTEMBER. *Third Edition Cr 8vo 7s 6d net***THE HAPPY FAMILY *Second Edition 7s 6d net*****ON THE STAIRCASE *Third Edition 7s 6d net*****Wells (H. G.) BEALBY *Fourth Edition Cr 8vo 7s 6d. net*****Williamson (C. N. and A. M.)—**

THE LIGHTNING CONDUCTOR The Strange
Adventures of a Motor Car LADY BETTY
ACROSS THE WATER SCARLET RUNNER
LORD LOVELAND DISCOVERS AMERICA
THE GUESTS OF HERCULES IT HAPPENED
IN EGYPT A SOLDIER OF THE LEGION
THE SHOP GIRL THE LIGHTNING CON-
DUCTRESS SECRET HISTORY THE LOVE
PIRATE. *All 7s 6d. net.* CRUCIFIX
CORNER. *6s net.*

Methuen's Two-Shilling Novels

Cheap Editions of many of the most Popular Novels of the day

Write for Complete List

Fcap. 8vo

